

Illinois State Board of Education

State Template for the Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act



U.S. Department of Education

OMB Number: 1810-0576

Expiration Date: November 30, 2019

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)¹, permits the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State Education Agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated state plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. The Secretary must establish, for each covered program under section 8302 of the ESEA and additional programs designated by the Secretary, the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated state plan.

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) encourages each state to think comprehensively about implementation of programs across the ESEA and to leverage funding to ensure a focus on equity and excellence for all students as it develops its consolidated state plan. Further, ED aims to support collaboration and efficiency across multiple programs to help ensure that all children have significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and that each SEA works to close achievement gaps.²

ED identified five overarching components and corresponding elements that integrate the included programs and that must be addressed by each SEA electing to submit a consolidated state plan. These components encourage each SEA to plan and implement included programs in a comprehensive way to support Local Education Agencies (LEAs), schools, and all subgroups of students. Consistent with the Secretary's authority in 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d) to establish the date, time, and manner for submission of the consolidated state plan, ED has established this template for submitting the consolidated state plan. Within each component, each SEA is required to provide descriptions related to implementation of the programs the SEA includes in the consolidated state plan. The consolidated state plan template includes a section for each of the components, as well as a section for the long-term goals required under the statewide accountability system in section 1111(c)(4)(a) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a).

The sections are as follows:

1. Long-Term Goals
2. Consultation and Performance Management
3. Academic Assessments
4. Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
5. Supporting Excellent Educators
6. Supporting All Students

When developing its consolidated state plan, ED encourages each SEA to reflect on its overall vision and how the different sections of the consolidated state plan work together to create one comprehensive approach to improving outcomes for all students. ED encourages each SEA to consider: (1) what is the SEA's vision

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

² In developing its consolidated state plan, each SEA must meet the requirements section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act and describe the steps it will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

with regard to its education system; (2) how does this plan help drive toward that vision; and (3) how will the SEA evaluate its effectiveness on an ongoing basis?

DRAFT

Instruction for Completing the Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all required elements of the consolidated state plan. Although the information an SEA provides for each requirement will reflect that particular requirement, an SEA is encouraged to consider whether particular descriptions or strategies meet multiple requirements or goals. In developing its consolidated state plan, an SEA should consider all requirements to ensure that it develops a comprehensive and coherent consolidated state plan.

Submission Procedures

Each SEA must submit to ED its consolidated state plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017;** or
- **September 18, 2017.**

ED will not review plans on a rolling basis; consequently, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(ii), a consolidated state plan or an individual program state plan that addresses all of the required components received:

- On or prior to April 3, 2017, is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on April 3, 2017.
- Between April 4 and September 18, 2017, is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on September 18, 2017.

Each SEA must submit either a consolidated state plan or individual program state plans for all included programs that meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements in a single submission by one of the above deadlines.

ED will provide additional information regarding the manner of submission (e.g., paper or electronic) at a later date consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(i).

Publication of State Plan

After the Secretary approves a consolidated state plan or an individual program state plan, an SEA must publish its approved plan(s) on the SEA's website in a format and language, to the extent practicable, that the public can access and understand in compliance with the requirements under 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3).

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at [OSS.\[State\]@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.[State]@ed.gov) (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position)	Telephone
Mailing Address:	Email Address:
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)	Telephone:
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative	Date:
Signature of Governor (If Applicable)	Date:

The SEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to the enclosed assurances.

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated state plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated state plan, but is eligible and still wishes to receive funds under that program or programs, it must submit individual program plans that meet all statutory requirements with its consolidated state plan in a single submission, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(iii).

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated state plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below for which the SEA is submitting an individual program state plan:

- ☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies
- ☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- ☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- ☐ Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students
- ☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- ☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC)
- ☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- ☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act): Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

Educator Equity Extension

☒ Check this box if the SEA is requesting an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3). An SEA that receives this extension must calculate and report in this consolidated state plan the differences in rates based on school-level data for each of the groups listed in section 5.3.B and describe how the SEA will eliminate any differences in rates based on the school-level data consistent with section 5.3.E. An SEA that requests this extension must also provide a detailed plan and timeline in Appendix C addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated state plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level.

Introduction

The mission of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is to “provide leadership and resources to achieve excellence across all Illinois districts through engaging legislators, school administrators, teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in formulating and advocating for policies that enhance education, empower districts, and ensure equitable outcomes for all students.” ISBE sees the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) as an opportunity to live this mission in partnership with Illinois stakeholders.³

In Illinois, we believe that a universal culture of high expectations is fundamental to creating and supporting the conditions that provide the best opportunities for all students. ESSA fosters the conditions for Illinois to implement a holistic, comprehensive, and coordinated system of support that prepares each and every student for academic excellence and postsecondary success. Illinois is using the opportunities provided through ESSA to reduce barriers to learning in order to achieve fair access to high-quality educational opportunities for each and every child.

In developing the state plan for Illinois, ISBE has worked diligently to engage stakeholders through a collaborative process in order to learn from their expertise. ISBE recognizes that engaging a broad representation of stakeholder groups, all of whom are committed to improving student outcomes, is a crucial aspect in the development and implementation of an education delivery system that results in success for each and every child. From the inception of the process in January 2016 through submission to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) in April of 2017, ISBE recognized an opportunity through ESSA to actively engage Illinois residents on all aspects of creating a better education system in Illinois. The result of this collaboration is a plan that is both consistent with the law and reflective of the values and thinking in Illinois. The next important step in this work is implementation. While Illinois’ ESSA State Plan reflects many of the ideas offered by stakeholders, it is important to note that ideas not listed in this plan are not forgotten or ignored. Some of the input we received is specific to implementation and will guide our next steps. The relationships we built with stakeholders in the planning process will be essential as implementation begins such that we can discuss and develop shared action steps.

³ ESSA, signed into law by President Obama on December 10, 2015, is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the national education law.

ISBE has co-authored four drafts of the ESSA State Plan with educators, community members, and national experts. This fourth draft is different from initial drafts as it presents the work we have developed collaboratively with all required participants, includes a formal introduction, and includes the template for submission of the consolidated state plan provided by ED in December 2016.

This template contains six sections: Long-Term Goals; Consultation and Performance Management; Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students. At the conclusion of the introduction of the required template, ED provides:

When developing its consolidated state plan, the Department encourages each State Education Agency (SEA) to reflect on its overall vision and how the different sections of the consolidated state plan work together to create one comprehensive approach to improving outcomes for all students. The Department encourages each SEA to consider: (1) what is the SEA's vision with regard to its education system; (2) how does this plan help drive toward that vision; and (3) how will the SEA evaluate its effectiveness on an ongoing basis?

Articulating this comprehensive vision is challenging within the structure of the template insofar as it requires the state to respond to prompts that, for the purposes of compliance, are compartmentalized. To more fully articulate the vision for Illinois and how ESSA assists us with making our vision real, this introduction connects topics in ways that allow for Illinois to share our values and, from this, the story about the educational opportunities and supports we are working to provide for each and every child in Illinois schools.

Vision, Mission, and Goals

At the outset of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, the vision, mission, and goals of the ISBE are shared:

Vision

Illinois is a state of whole, healthy children nested in whole, healthy systems supporting communities wherein all citizens are socially and economically secure.

Mission

Provide leadership and resources to achieve excellence across all Illinois districts through engaging legislators, school administrators, teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in formulating

and advocating for policies that enhance education, empower districts, and ensure equitable outcomes for all students.

Goals

Every child in each public school system in the State of Illinois deserves to attend a system wherein...

- All kindergartners are assessed for readiness.
- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.
- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

The vision, mission, and goals of ISBE directly contribute to a larger set of Illinois initiatives wherein by the year 2025, 60 percent or more of Illinoisans will hold a high-quality degree or postsecondary credential.

Illinois has clearly articulated a bold set of ideas and aspirations that with considerable collective effort and policy support will be realized over time. In Illinois, we know that a vision, mission, and supporting goals are only as useful as the collective work to make real what appears aspirational. The work we describe in ESSA is evidence of this collective quest. The most important question posed by ED is, “How does the state plan for Illinois, developed through deliberation and collaboration, assist in realizing the vision, mission, and goals articulated by ISBE?”

A partial answer to this question is provided by understanding the importance of deliberation and collaboration in working through the important values held by those involved in the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois.

Collaboration

“It is for this reason...at the present time not to be distracted in allowing any issue, no matter how useful in itself, to displace the freedom of intelligence in public communication by means of speech, publication in daily and weekly press, in books, in public assemblies, in scientific inquiry, as the center and burning focus of democracy. Nothing will be more fatal in the end than surrender and

compromise on this point. Now, more than ever, it is urgently necessary to hold it in steady view as the heart from which flows the life-blood of democracy.”⁴

Listening to and learning from stakeholders created the foundation upon which the Illinois ESSA State Plan was developed. As John Dewey, American philosopher, psychologist, and education reformer in the early 20th century, suggests above, public deliberation is essential for both sustaining and growing democracy. Creating and holding multiple public spaces for the introduction and contemplation of ideas was and is necessary in order to develop the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. This public space requires multiple avenues of entry for interested individuals and groups to share their values, opinions, and beliefs focused upon the “problem of practice,” also known as ESSA. It is also essential in that the relationships and interdependence developed through dialogue will make the more difficult work of implementation significantly more possible.

Current problems of practice most often emerge from previous contexts or challenges. In this case, the previous context for ESSA is No Child Left Behind (NCLB). In the case of ESSA, these previous contexts and their interrelationships can be understood as an attempt to reach greater equity through compliance, pressure, and oversight. NCLB was a promise that all children would do better in school and this obligation to all children was manifest through oversight, competition, and federal overreach.

These conditions for students, educators, and administrators were determined from afar. Ultimately, the rules often created confusion, resentment, and frustration for educators, families, communities, and, most importantly, students. The intent of NCLB, if actualized, was a public good. The ability to name deep inequities in educational opportunity and outcomes is ground we must not lose in our efforts to educate all children. However, the requirements for this public good, in fact, silenced many of those who needed to do the real work: educators and communities committed to improving the lives of their students. This silencing is precisely what Dewey was warning against in his writing and speaking. We suffer the loss of local wisdom and capacity to transform when the voices of those who have to live the requirements of a law or practice are removed from important communal deliberation and when the notion of expertise is limited to those far removed from the everyday living of a law or practice.

⁴ Dewey, J. (ca. 1946), “What is Democracy” (unpublished manuscript, ca. 1946), Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Box 55, Folder 3.

When a problem of practice emerges from a previous context, it is not a rejection of the past. It is an opportunity to learn from the past by taking parts that were important and placing them in a new context. When ESSA was signed into law on December 10, 2015, there were artifacts from NCLB that carried forward into the new law. Most specifically, ESSA kept the focus on equity of outcomes from NCLB that is essential to national prosperity and security. One of the most significant modifications from NCLB, however, was the acknowledgement that expertise existed in many spaces and the importance of this expertise in the development and implementation of the state plan. ESSA also acknowledges the critical importance of connecting early childhood education all the way through to postsecondary attainment. The authors of ESSA acknowledged what was overlooked in NCLB -- that those who were required to “live” ESSA should have a voice in the conditions that constitute the work.

ESSA requires collaboration with stakeholders as part of creating state plans. ISBE fully embraced this requirement and has gone to great lengths to engage the entire state through a variety of means. The State Board’s hypothesis is that if we repeatedly engage community members in the conversation about what we want Illinois students to know and be able to do, ask educators and community members what support and accountability for these outcomes should look like, and connect these new networks to already existing groups that this approach would lead to the development of a plan that is durable, nimble, and robust enough to radically improve educational outcomes in the state so that we can reach our goal of having 60 percent of Illinoisans with a high-quality degree or postsecondary credential by 2025.

ISBE conducted three listening tours around the state to introduce ESSA and take feedback from educators and community members (including students and families). We also held meetings with content experts to gain insight and recommendations on the accountability requirements of the plan. In addition to this work, ISBE also established an email address through which individuals and stakeholders could submit their comments, critiques, and suggestions. The result of this work is a state plan that is grounded in the belief that each and every child should have easy access to high-quality educational opportunities. The Illinois ESSA State Plan is the result of many drafts. The first draft included divergent opinions; we sought feedback on how to reconcile those opinions. The second and third drafts narrowed the range of ideas. Finally in draft four, we produced a plan that is responsive to local needs while meeting statewide goals and meeting the federal obligations in ESSA.

ESSA requires that a state regularly revisit its plan to ensure that the plan is, in fact, producing the intended outcomes. If student outcomes do not meet those described in the plan, then ISBE will

collaborate with stakeholders to determine the best approach to improving student outcomes. We are expected to implement this plan, continuously improve this plan, and ensure community members stay engaged in this work. Public deliberation is what Dewey emphasized as being good for the nurturing of democracy. The opportunity provided in ESSA for public deliberation is essential to ensure that Illinois' ESSA State Plan is a living document and its promise is realized in support of the whole child and a more economically vibrant Illinois.

The Whole Child

Both stakeholders and ISBE have been deliberate in identifying the importance of meeting the needs of “the whole child”⁵ throughout the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. We believe caring for “the whole child” is an essential part of promoting academic excellence. The notion of “the whole child” in the ESSA State Plan for Illinois can be understood as a child within an ecology of multiple and interconnected parts (e.g., the child is an individual composed of interacting parts, such as cognitive, social and emotional, and physical, among others, *and* that this individual lives within overlapping environments including, but not limited to, home, school, and community). This idea has been articulated by the Governor’s Cabinet on Children and Youth and suggested by multiple stakeholders. It is well described by the visual expression of the child as central to and living within an interconnected system.⁶

⁵ ISBE, throughout the plan, attempts to include “the whole child” when using terminology such as “for each and every child,” “all students,” and “every student.”

⁶ Image accessed from <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/images/wsc-model-ig.png> on January 14, 2017. For additional information on the Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child model, please access <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/wsc/index.htm>.



However, if “the whole child” is understood as expressed above, then there are additional relationships inside and outside of school to ensure that the needs of the “the whole child” are met.⁷ One important relationship not highlighted in the above image is the importance of ensuring that each and every child has access to highly effective educators who utilize a standards-based rigorous curriculum to develop new and more refined understandings. In this way, the needs of child are met through adapting instruction based upon child’s interest, readiness level, and learning profile and allow for multiple modes of representation. The intersection of academic rigor and the ideas shared above are woven through the vision, mission, and goals of the Illinois State Board of Education and ESSA will assist in bringing those ideas to life.

Vision

Illinois is a state of whole, healthy children nested in whole, healthy systems supporting communities wherein all citizens are socially and economically secure.

⁷ While the following will frame the work identified in the vision, mission, and goals in a means/end continuum, it is not intended to create a simple dichotomy. Rather, its intent is to demonstrate the necessary interactions and feedback loops necessary in order for a vision, mission, and goals to be realized.

The ISBE vision targets the following ends (outcomes): “whole, healthy children” and “whole, healthy systems.” The mission includes additional ends: “.... empower[ment] of districts, and equitable outcomes for all students.” Finally, the Board goals as outcomes and the long-term goals for students also serve as ends. Many stakeholders were curious throughout the drafting of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois about the means through which ISBE will achieve its identified ends. ISBE and the school districts we support are necessary, but not sufficient, to generate these outcomes. Meeting the needs of the “whole child” is, in fact, a “whole community” effort.

Local school districts are best positioned to serve as the community hubs for improving the life outcomes of children and families. The ESSA State Plan is one part of coordinating and improving systems in Illinois.

System of Support

The most obvious area in the ESSA State Plan for Illinois where “leadership and resources” are provided is through IL-EMPOWER. Most simply, IL-EMPOWER will serve as the statewide system of support for schools identified for comprehensive supports and services.⁸ IL-EMPOWER services are, however, available to *all* schools and districts in Illinois.⁹ IL-EMPOWER is a structure through which school improvement services are delivered.

ISBE will release the requirements for vendor pre-approval in spring 2017 through which providers of service focusing on improving student outcomes may apply and be pre-approved. Schools identified for comprehensive services will work with pre-approved providers to select the provider(s) that best meet the needs of the school community as determined through a needs assessment/equity audit.¹⁰ Schools will, with their selected provider(s), develop a work plan with improvement targets and metrics related to the information gleaned from the needs assessment/equity audit. ISBE will use fiscal year 2016 and FY 2017 carryover dollars, as well as FY 2018 Statewide System of Support dollars, for this work.

⁸ Schools identified for targeted services and supports may use the services of IL-EMPOWER, but they are not required to do so as their plans for support and improvement are approved at the district level.

⁹ Schools that are not identified for comprehensive services that wish to use an approved provider through IL-EMPOWER will need to conduct a needs assessment and equity audit in order to obtain the services.

¹⁰ ESSA requires that a needs assessment is conducted to determine areas requiring additional support. ISBE, while not disagreeing with this, also believes that an equity audit at the school level can be instructive in identifying areas in need of support and/or equity gaps. Thus, ISBE is currently working on an approach that will provide schools with the information they require and intends to have a draft of the instrument completed by spring 2017.

ISBE will utilize field-based staff to assist districts and schools identify areas in need of support as well as connecting schools and districts together in peer networks in order to support one another. The agency has a major role to play in increasing statewide collaboration and sharing effective practices that will make a demonstrable difference in student outcomes. Sharing data, promoting effective practices, and facilitating connections across districts are core functions of the agency going forward. Capacity in individual schools and districts is necessary; however, it will not be sufficient to improve the entire system. Building collective capacity in Illinois to reach our 60 percent by 2025 goal is the only way we'll get there.

The intersections of IL-EMPOWER, accountability, and assessments are really the heart, head, and hands of the plan. It is too simplistic to state that assessments (and other accountability indicators) are used for the purposes of accountability and accountability is used for the purposes of identifying schools for support. Logistically, this may be true, but what is missing from this picture is the powerful positive interdependence of each aspect of the system. In classrooms, the relationship between instruction, learning, and assessment is what drives positive growth. If we look at schools like the children they serve, they are learning and growing. The thoughtful intersection of IL-EMPOWER, accountability, and assessment is our best way to drive positive growth statewide.

Assessment and Accountability

"First of all, as everyone knows, America doesn't do well on international tests.....But, where we undoubtedly lead the world is in variability. American standard deviations on all the [international] tests are just about at the top.....No country in the civilized world can match us in terms of the maldistribution of wealth...none can match the gap we create between our most literate and least literate countrymen. Ours is a diversity of inequality."¹¹

"I want to argue that one of the principal ways in which our minds are shaped to daily life is through the stories we tell and listen to – whether truth or fiction. We learn our culture principally through the stories that circulate within its bounds."¹²

¹¹ Bruner, Jerome S. *The Bulletin*. Boston, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2004.

¹² Bruner, Jerome S. *In Search of Pedagogy: The Selected Works of Jerome Bruner*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Jerome Bruner, like Dewey, was a public intellectual. His work was expansive and encompassed such diverse, yet interrelated, interests as concept formation, instructional design and delivery, and the use of storytelling as a central way of making meaning. He was committed to the public good. Bruner was an expert at making his work understandable to a variety of audiences. What he identifies in the quotes above is an example of the multiple ways one can view the use and outcomes of an assessment (e.g., the story one may wish to tell). His story on this topic emphasizes the possible intersections of the uses and outcomes of assessment results. For Bruner, assessment results could be used for the purpose of comparison. Comparison between two or more things or groups or ideas can be useful or not. These comparisons can lead to judgments of “good/bad,” “better/worse,” or “correct/incorrect.” What Bruner creates is a good way to discuss the various tensions resulting when considering the uses of assessment and, by extension, accountability. We heard about this tension in Illinois. We did not hear, however, that the current outcomes and access to quality educational opportunities are acceptable to anyone. We heard about the urgent need for better outcomes and better access across all groups of students.

The assessment and accountability sections of Illinois ESSA State Plan identify, among other things, the assessments Illinois will administer each school year to children in grades 3 through 8. More specifically, student performance on these assessments is part of the required academic indicators within ESSA. Illinois is also required to select one or more school quality indicators that are used along with required academic indicators for the purposes of accountability.

As indicated previously, one of the nationally important elements of NCLB that remains is the requirement of annual testing in grades 3 through 8. The purpose of annual testing is to ensure that groups of children are meeting particular learning targets at particular times to ensure all children have fair access to high-quality public schools and are receiving the support they require.

ESSA retains the NCLB requirement for annual testing, and states now have additional say in selecting non-academic indicators and determining what weight both academic and non-academic indicators will hold within an accountability system. The importance of recognizing growth is also present in ways it was not in NCLB. The authors of ESSA saw the error of placing the entire locus of control with those farthest removed from the work that occurs in schools around the country. Moving this control closer to those who do the work provides ways to describe and support the complex interrelationship between the various levels of responsibility for student outcomes (e.g., federal, state, and local).

Many groups and individuals shared their thinking on school quality indicators and the weighting of indicators as the Illinois plan was developed. The weighting of the academic indicators and school quality indicators will identify schools in need of support and as well those well positioned to support them. Unlike NCLB before it, ESSA emphasizes supporting schools and districts. We believe a quality accountability system that focuses on equity and growth is the cornerstone of our next chapter of improving student outcomes in Illinois.

In order for Illinois' educators to create a positive story, educators must become the central protagonists. Teachers, school service personnel, principals, superintendents, and school boards are directly responsible for putting Illinois on the path to 60 percent by 2025. The good work that is occurring with their students and staff must be identified and highlighted. The stories of educational excellence must be shared locally, regionally, and statewide. At the same time, a system of support needs to be robust and accessible enough so that schools, as living and breathing institutions, can ask for and receive the support they need without shame.

Every student in Illinois deserves to attend a high-quality school. If there isn't a high-quality education option for students where they live, that is a problem for all of Illinois. The statewide goal of 60 percent by 2025 will require some significant change and support in places where students and communities aren't on that track yet. It will also require a new and more comprehensive model of engagement and support from communities already on that track.

Supports for Educators and Students

ISBE is committed to supporting educators in the development of their professional capital. Professional capital is the knowledge, skills, and understandings that an educator uses to meet the needs of the whole child in the context of a professional community. This suggests that educator knowledge, skills, and understanding certainly include things such as, but not limited to, human development, instructional design and delivery, universal design, differentiated instruction, balanced assessment practices, and data and assessment literacy. In addition to these areas, educators must be sensitive to the experiences that each and every child brings into the school and classroom(s) and the appropriate supports that may assist the child as they develop. The professional capital possessed by educators is the means through which they meet the ends in

support of each and every child.¹³ The State of Illinois must prioritize collective, collaborative professional capital as a means of improving schools, districts, and communities.

Schools ought to be places in which each and every child can -- through trying and sometimes failing, and trying again -- develop a rich sense of self. This sense of self is most clearly described in that they can see a positive future for themselves in the world. This is part of the common good of public schooling. As described in the “whole child” diagram, this sense of self is developed both inside and outside of the school. The experiences provided to children within school are deliberately designed and limited in terms of time, whereas that is not always the case outside of school. Nonetheless, children in Illinois’ schools should be able to access and pursue multiple educational opportunities (e.g., Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate offerings and exams; career and technical education experiences – both exploratory work and career pathways; and access to experiences in the fine arts that allow the student to create, perform, and critique, among others). These opportunities should be based upon one or more of the following: interest, readiness level, and/or learning profile.¹⁴ These experiences should provide children the opportunity for multiple modes of representing their understanding. These opportunities should be pursued in environments that are safe for children to try out ideas and learn from their mistakes in what educator/author Linda Darling-Hammond calls a “culture of revision and redemption.”¹⁵

In order to provide these opportunities for students, Illinois is obligated to provide resources and training to educators so that they can more readily provide these opportunities for students. Providing those resources and training is a central part of the work articulated in the ESSA State Plan for Illinois.¹⁶ In addition to the “within school” work articulated within the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, stakeholders also suggested that ISBE be deliberate in its “between school” work and

¹³ For clarity of example, the “educator” in this example is a classroom teacher. However, ISBE recognizes the important work of administrators, teacher leaders, school service personnel, paraprofessionals, and other staff at the school who are essential in supporting the whole child.

¹⁴ This statement should not be understood as a child only accesses opportunities when ready or interested or when some characteristic of her or his learning profile is “met.” Rather, it is meant to suggest that readiness, interest, and learning profile are used to support the student in moving toward and accessing the particular opportunity in which the student is interested.

¹⁵ Darling-Hammond, Linda. *Redesigning High Schools: What matters and What Works*. Stanford, CA: School Redesign Network, 2002. https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/10-features-good-small-schools-redesigning-high-schools-what-matters-and-what-works_0.pdf.

¹⁶ This work will occur deliberately on the part of ISBE. ISBE is currently developing a scope and calendar of the resources and training necessary to “move” this work forward. So, too, but possibly in a more limited way, IL-EMPOWER vendors will provide these supports should a school identify this as an area in need of support.

use ESSA as an opportunity to clarify the importance of transitions between natural “fractures” in school composition. Students are much more likely to be comfortable in school within a system in which moving from building to building, based upon grade level, is thoughtful and deliberate care is taken to ensure the supports necessary are “moving” with the child.¹⁷

Conclusion

We take seriously the questions posed by ED within the ESSA template. This introduction is our attempt to demonstrate the state vision for education and how ESSA is an opportunity to assist Illinois in achieving our vision. At the same time, this text is our effort to extend beyond the required sections in the template to provide the field with intentions that were difficult, if not impossible, to articulate in the ED template.

To this end, we emphasize the importance of collaboration and deliberation in the entire process. The work that has occurred thus far has demonstrated what this collaboration and deliberation can and should be when matters of importance for the public good are considered. Supporting the whole child and how this notion enhances the vision, mission, and goals of ISBE and Illinois was considered. We feel that it is vitally important that Illinoisans achieve academic excellence and earn postsecondary credentials in order for the state to achieve social and economic vitality.

This narrative description is intended to recognize, thank, and appreciate the people of Illinois, who care deeply about quality education, and ensure that all students have fair access to quality. Countless individuals have spent extraordinary amounts of their personal and professional time assisting ISBE in the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. However, submitting and receiving approval for the plan is only the beginning of the work. To take this strategy and make it result in an excellent education for each and every child in Illinois is work that lies ahead. We must become better partners for the success of our more than 2 million preK-12 students if we hope to achieve our short- and long-term statewide goals.

¹⁷ One way that ISBE is asking schools and districts to consider this will occur within the Title application where there is an expectation that schools will be able to articulate how they transition students throughout the P-12 continuum.

Long-term Goals

Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its state-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the state's minimum number of students.

In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.

A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its state-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

The vision, mission, and goals of ISBE and ESSA explicitly focus on the equity of services, resources, and supports available for each and every child in order for them to be successful in school and beyond. NCLB, the predecessor to ESSA, put in place a structure to ensure that all children would be proficient in English language arts and mathematics, but it did not recognize or honor local expertise and context. ESSA, in doing so, allows states and districts the opportunity to create an accountability system that is grounded upon the belief that each and every child has the right to be taught and supported by a highly effective teacher in order to grow into confident, competent, and connected young person. ESSA, moreover, allows ISBE and districts (LEAs) to create and participate in a statewide system of support. This statewide system of support in connection with the accountability system assists not only in the identification of districts eligible to receive supports but those who are in a position to provide support, should they choose. Put differently, ESSA provides ISBE the opportunity, through the following vision, mission, and goals, to advocate for schools and support the whole child:¹⁸

Vision

Illinois is a state of whole, healthy children nested in whole, healthy systems supporting communities wherein all citizens are socially and economically secure.

¹⁸ Retrieved on January 14, 2017, from <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Agency-and-Board-Information.aspx>.

Mission

Provide leadership and resources to achieve excellence across all Illinois districts through engaging legislators, school administrators, teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in formulating and advocating for policies that enhance education, empower districts, and ensure equitable outcomes for all students.

Goals

Every child in each public school system in the State of Illinois deserves to attend a system wherein...

- All kindergartners are assessed for readiness.
- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.
- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

ISBE determined that using the following Board goals also make sense as the ambitious long-term goals:

- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.

So, too, these goals align with a larger state goal whereby 60 percent of its residents earn high-quality degrees and career credentials by 2025.¹⁹

In previous iterations of the plan, ISBE identified a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals. This recommendation emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the proposed timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The state-level long-term goals and measurements of interim progress are based on progressive increases in the percentage of all learners in Illinois who make annual progress toward the long-term goals.

The Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee (IBAMC) concurred with the proposed 15-year timeline in its final recommendations, but recommended interim goals over a five- or six-year time frame.

For the purposes of identification for support, ISBE will use a three-year benchmarking process in order to identify a baseline from which three-year interim goals will be identified. A baseline will be established from no less than the most recent three years of academic achievement assessment data included as academic indicators in the accountability system required in ESSA. Once the baseline for academic achievement for all students and each subgroup has been established, the 90 percent targets will be back mapped with the timeline of interim goals determined by the State Board.

ISBE will use a three-year composite average to establish its baseline performance levels and measures of interim progress. Baseline data will not be available until state assessment for all students has been administered and recorded for all student demographic groups for three consecutive years. Currently, data is only available for students in grades 3 through 8 for two school years (2014-15 and 2015-16). The adoption of the SAT at the high school level means three years of data will be available after the administration of the exam during the 2018-19 school year.

ISBE will collect and report data, through grade 12, for former English Learners (ELs) and children formally identified with a disability, in addition to the subgroups required in ESSA, in order to ensure equity.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

¹⁹ Addition information on the 60x25 initiative can be accessed at <http://www.isac.org/home/isac-big-goal.html>.

ISBE will use a three-year composite average to establish its baseline performance levels and measures of interim progress for the subgroups listed below. Interim goals will be established at such a time when the data is available as gleaned from the accountability system required in ESSA. Information on the proposed timeline and years in which data will be available are shared below.

Subgroups	Reading/ Language Arts: Baseline Data and Year	Reading/ Language Arts: Long- term Goal	Mathematics: Baseline Data and Year	Mathematics: Long-term Goal
All students	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Economically disadvantaged students	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Children with disabilities	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
English Learners ²⁰	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Black or African American	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Hispanic or Latino	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Native American or Alaskan Native	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
White	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Two or more races	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Asian	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032	K-8 2018 HS 2019	90% 2032

²⁰ Please note, first-year scores on required state content assessment for newly identified ELs will not be used for the purposes of accountability.

Subgroups	Reading/ Language Arts: Baseline Data and Year	Reading/ Language Arts: Long- term Goal	Mathematics: Baseline Data and Year	Mathematics: Long-term Goal
Former English Learners	K-8 2020 HS 2020	90% 2032	K-8 2020 HS 2020	90% 2032
Children formerly with a disability	2020	90% 2032	2020	90% 2032

B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its state-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

ISBE proposed a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals, that emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the proposed timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The state-level long-term goals and measurements of interim progress are based on progressive increases in the graduation rate. The target of 90 percent of students graduating college and career ready is based on goals adopted by the Board in September of 2015. The college and career readiness indicator in the accountability system will also provide data necessary for the calculation of a baseline graduation rate and interim goals in order to meet the board goal of “90 percent or more of students will graduate from high school college and career ready.”

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.²¹

Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
All students	85.5% 2016	90% 2032

²¹ The baseline data provided in the chart is a one-year average. It does not include data from the college and career readiness indicator. ISBE will have a three-year average for the four-year, five-year, and six-year adjusted graduation rate at the conclusion of the 2017-2018 for most subgroups (the former English Learners and children formally with a disability subgroups will have a three-year average in 2020).

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
Economically disadvantaged students	76.7% 2016	90% 2032
Children with disabilities	70.6% 2016	90% 2032
English Learners	71.9% 2016	90% 2032
Black or African American	74.6% 2016	90% 2032
Hispanic or Latino	81.3% 2016	90% 2032
Native American or Alaskan Native	79.3% 2016	90% 2032
White	90.4 % 2016	90% 2032
Two or more	84.7% 2016	90% 2032
Asian	93.6% 2016	90% 2032
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	84.8% 2016	90% 2032
Former English Learners	2020	90% 2032
Children formerly with a disability	2020	90% 2032

- iii. If applicable, provide the baseline and long-term goals for each extended-year cohort graduation rate(s) and describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements for such an extended-year rate or rates that are more rigorous as compared to the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress than the four-year adjusted cohort rate, including how the SEA established its state-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

ISBE will also utilize five-year and six-year extended cohort graduation rates as a part of its accountability system.

Five-Year Extended Cohort Graduation Rate

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
All students	87.7% 2016	90% 2032
Economically disadvantaged students	81.8% 2016	90% 2032
Children with disabilities	75.1% 2016	90% 2032
English Learners	77.8% 2016	90% 2032
Black or African American	79.2% 2016	90% 2032
Hispanic or Latino	84.2% 2016	90% 2032
Native American or Alaskan	82.4% 2016	90% 2032

Native		
White	91.4% 2016	90% 2032
Two or more Races	87.3% 2016	90% 2032
Asian	95.5% 2016	90% 2032
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	88.4% 2016	90% 2032
Former English Learners	2020	90% 2032
Children formerly with a disability	2020	90% 2032

Six -Year Extended Cohort Graduation Rate

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
All students	88.2% 2016	90% 2032
Economically disadvantaged students	82.2% 2016	90% 2032
Children with disabilities	76.5% 2016	90% 2032
English Learners	78.8% 2016	90% 2032
Black or African American	79.9% 2016	90% 2032
Hispanic or Latino	85.0% 2016	90% 2032
Native American or Alaskan Native	90.6% 2016	90% 2032
White	91.6% 2016	90% 2032
Two or more Races	88.3% 2016	90% 2032
Asian	95.9% 2016	90% 2032
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	84.5% 2016	90% 2032
Former English Learners	2020	90% 2032
Children formerly with a disability	2020	90% 2032

C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **Description.** Describe the state's uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English Learners (ELs) in the state, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:
 1. How the state considers a student's English language proficiency (ELP) level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the state takes into account (*e.g.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).
 2. The applicable timelines over which ELs sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a state-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that state-determined maximum.

3. How the student-level targets expect all ELs to make annual progress toward attaining ELP within the applicable timelines.

1. A uniform procedure is applied to all students in Illinois upon enrollment for the first time to any school or preschool program in order to identify students for whom English is not their first language. An appropriate prescribed placement screening assessment is administered within 30 days of a student's enrollment in the district to those students who have a language other than English documented in the Home Language Survey^{22 23 24}. Students whose English proficiency score is below the state-defined minimum for ELP on the prescribed assessment are eligible for services and are placed into a Transitional Bilingual Education or Transitional Program of Instruction program to receive language instructional services. School districts in Illinois must annually assess the English language proficiency of all ELs in kindergarten through 12 using ACCESS for ELLs for the purpose of determining the continuing need and eligibility of individual students for language program services.

2. Illinois proposes a maximum timeline of five years for English Learners to achieve ELP on the annual ELP assessment,²⁵ ACCESS for ELLs, commencing in first grade, which is the first mandatory grade for student attendance in Illinois.²⁶ However, ELs in Illinois are not exited from English language instructional program services or status until attaining English language proficiency according to state-established reclassification criteria without regard to the timeline.²⁷

²² [23 Illinois Administrative Code 228, Section 228.15.](#)

²³ Office of Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education and the Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice, "Dear Colleague Letter." (January 2015): <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-el-201501.pdf>.

²⁴ Linqianti, Robert, Cook, H. Gary, Bailey, Alison, & MacDonald, Rita. Moving Toward a More Common Definition of English Learner: Collected Guidance for States and Multi-State Assessment Consortia. Council of Chief State School Officers (2016).

²⁵ Cook, Gary, Robert Linqianti, Marjorie Chinen, and Hyekyung Jung. "National Evaluation of Title III Implementation Supplemental Report: Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring English Learner Progress. Draft." Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, US Department of Education (2012).

²⁶ Hakuta, Kenji. "How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency." University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute (2000). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/13w7m06g>.

²⁷ Linqianti, Robert, and Cathy George. "Establishing and utilizing an NCLB Title III accountability system: California's approach and findings to date." English language proficiency assessment in the nation: Current status and future practice (2007): 105-118.

3. The student-level targets that English Learners make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency on the ACCESS for ELLs within five years will be determined once Illinois establishes a revised ELP cut score for reclassification based on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment, which is aligned to college readiness standards. ISBE will receive recommendations for the appropriate cut score from stakeholders in June 2017.
4. Describe how the SEA established ambitious state-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English Learners in the state making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the state-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

ISBE proposed a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals, that emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The target of 90 percent readiness is based on the goals adopted by the Board in September of 2015. A baseline will be established for required state content assessments over the most recent three years of ELP assessment data in consideration of WIDA's standard setting. Once the baseline for ACCESS of ELs within each school has been established, the 90 percent targets to 2032 will be back mapped with the timeline of interim goals determined by the State Board. To ensure that former EL students are making similar gains in achievement and growth as other students, ISBE will collect and report data on students identified as former ELs through grade 12.

More specifically, within the EL Proficiency category of the accountability system, growth will be measured for all EL students K-12 by using the growth to target method. Consultation from WIDA and stakeholder engagement determined the growth to target would best fit the English Learner population and be the most understandable to parents. Students start on the growth trajectory at the composite proficiency level and grade at the time of their first annual assessment (ACCESS 2.0). The first year is considered year 0 or baseline. Year 1 growth is determined after the second annual ELP assessment. Growth to target trajectories will be calculated for students based on their grade, English proficiency scaled composite score, and the time it will take to reach proficiency using the 2016-17 baseline scores. ISBE, in consultation with stakeholders, will set reasonable expectations of the percentage of students to meet growth targets after data has been analyzed to determine schools' actual number of students meeting the

growth necessary for a five-year timeline. Schools will annually meet or exceed their goal of the percentage of students meeting their growth targets. Reporting categories will be: schools making below average progress with ELs, schools making average progress, and schools making above average progress with ELs, once data has been analyzed and targets have been established. ISBE will establish interim targets and report on schools in one of three categories: schools making better than expected growth, schools making adequate growth, and schools making less than adequate growth.

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year) ²⁸
English Learners	63.0% 2016	90% 2032

²⁸ This goal, 90% of EL students demonstrating proficiency by 2032, is not explicitly identified as an ISBE goal. The 90% proficient is the same as other ISBE goals (e.g., Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics) and is an expectation to achieve statewide equity goals.

Section 2: Consultation and Performance Management

2.1 Consultation.

Instructions: Each SEA must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders in developing its consolidated state plan, consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13 (b) and 299.15 (a). The stakeholders must include the following individuals and entities and reflect the geographic diversity of the state:

- The Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's Office;
- Members of the state legislature;
- Members of the state board of education, if applicable;
- LEAs, including LEAs in rural areas;
- Representatives of Indian tribes located in the state;
- Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, and organizations representing such individuals;
- Charter school leaders, if applicable;
- Parents and families;
- Community-based organizations;
- Civil rights organizations, including those representing students with disabilities, English Learners, and other historically underserved students;
- Institutions of higher education;
- Employers;
- Representatives of private school students;
- Early childhood educators and leaders; and
- The public.

Each SEA must meet the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3) to provide information that is:

1. Be in an understandable and uniform format;
2. Be, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and
3. Be, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12102, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

- A. Public Notice.** Provide evidence that the SEA met the public notice requirements, under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), relating to the SEA's processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan.

The importance of stakeholder feedback has both provided the foundation and substance of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. The process through which this plan was developed recognizes and honors the expertise of the field. The result of this collaboration is a plan that is consistent with the law and reflective of values and thinking of stakeholders. This collaboration provided the vision for the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. The next important step in this work is implementation. While Illinois' ESSA State Plan reflects many of the ideas offered by stakeholders, it is important to note

that those ideas that are not directly evidenced in this plan are not forgotten or ignored. Some of the input we received is specific to implementation and will guide our next steps.

The development of the ESSA State Plan occurred in five phases. The intention during the first four phases of this work was to listen and refine the ideas shared with ISBE. For example, during phase one, stakeholders identified more than 40 potential school quality/school success indicators; by the time the third draft of the state plan was shared, stakeholders had whittled this down to four indicators for inclusion in a P-8 accountability system and four indicators for inclusion within an accountability system for grades 9-12. Also, in previous drafts of the state plan ISBE asserted that achievement and growth should be weighted equally whereas the field thought differently. In this draft, growth is weighted significantly more than achievement. Moreover, in order to best ensure that stakeholders had the opportunity to share their ideas, ISBE, in addition to the required 30-day posting of the plan, posted each draft of the plan for multiple weeks.

ISBE believes that the work of implementing ESSA at the state and local levels only begins with the submission of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois to ED. Furthermore, ISBE deeply values the thinking and dedicated work provided by educators and other stakeholders for the children of Illinois each day.

As mentioned throughout the plan development, one of the most important opportunities available in ESSA is the ability for states to amend the plan. To do this well, will require us to continuously know and understand the thoughts of Illinois' stakeholders. For instance, ISBE requires the input of stakeholders in the short term for a variety of different projects:

- The development of a unique P2 schools quality/student success indicator,
- For the purpose of data collection, the definition of career ready indicators,
- A recommendation on a proficiency level for the ACCESS exam, and
- A recommendation on an elementary/middle school indicator.²⁹

In the longer term -- and acknowledging that there is great expertise and knowledge within districts in Illinois -- ISBE, as part of its statewide system of support, would like to support schools in their sharing of best practices with other districts. More specifically, those districts that, through the accountability system required in ESSA, demonstrate that they have no underperforming subgroups and will be able to share their knowledge with other districts.

²⁹ In previous drafts, the elementary/middle level indicator was identified as "8th grade on-track." Feedback for the Office of the Governor suggested that this indicator should be more robust than only 8th grade on-track. This idea supports the belief of some stakeholders who stated that, just as in the college and career metaindicator in the 9-12 accountability system, there should be metaindicator in the P-8 accountability system.

So, too, ISBE, using Title II funds, will sponsor modest grants to districts that wish to undertake a 30-60-90 research project focusing on teacher leadership and share their results with the field.³⁰

The collaboration and consultation that occurred in the development of the ESSA State Plan was also a time for ISBE to articulate its belief in the importance of supporting and nurturing the whole child. It was evident that stakeholders believed the same. The creation of an ESSA State Plan for Illinois that is durable required that ISBE, stakeholders, and the Governor had opportunities to share ideas and reflect on the consideration of others. Composing a plan that has a laser-like focus on equity while acknowledging and appreciating that the work in supporting the whole child is iterative and will require the continued work and refinement of stakeholders, the Governor, and ISBE staff.

ISBE posted drafts of the state plan, public comment, reader's guides, and other materials at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/ESSA-Draft-Report.aspx>. This information has been repeatedly communicated through the Superintendent's Weekly Message and social media.

<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1136>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1134>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1133>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1132>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1131>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1128>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1126>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1117>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1114>
<https://www.isbe.net/Lists/News/NewsDisplay.aspx?ID=1112>

See Appendix D for maps of listening tour meeting locations.

- B. Outreach and Input.** For the components of the consolidated state plan, including Challenging Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students, describe how the SEA:
- i. Conducted outreach to and solicited input from the individuals and entities listed above, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), during the design and development of the SEA's plans

³⁰ 30-60-90 projects ask that a school (or faculty within the school) identify a question they would like answered. Typically, these questions surround climate and culture or an instructional practice. In the case of ISBE, and in support of attempting to recognize, clarify, and celebrate the work of teacher leaders, the projects will surround teacher leadership. At the beginning of the 3-month project, faculty will propose a question and identify a timeline and intended outcomes. At the conclusion of the 90 days, faculty will share results with their colleagues and the field.

to implement the programs that the SEA has indicated it will include in its consolidated state plan; and following the completion of its initial consolidated state plan by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submitting the consolidated state plan to the Department for review and approval.

ISBE's plan for informing stakeholders and collecting input prior to submitting a final draft to ED consisted of five phases:³¹

Phase One:

- January 2016 – July 2016
- Listening Tour 1 – April 2016-May 2016
- 46 meetings

Phase Two:

- July 2016 – September 2016
- Illinois' ESSA State Plan Draft 1 released on August 25, 2016, for six weeks of public comment
- Listening Tour 2 – September 2016
- 28 meetings

Phase Three:

- October 2016 – December 2016
- Illinois' ESSA State Plan Draft 2 released on November 18, 2016, for six weeks of public comment
- 20 meetings

Phase Four:

- January 2017 – April 2017
- February 1, 2017: Illinois' ESSA State Plan Draft 3 shared with Governor Bruce Rauner and posted on the ISBE website
- March 15, 2017: Illinois' ESSA State Plan Draft 4 shared with the Illinois State Board of Education for approval
- April 3, 2017: Illinois' ESSA State Plan submitted to ED

³¹ After submission of the plan, ISBE will provide districts will information regarding the transition year 2017-18 as well as information on implementation.

Phase Five

- April 4, 2017 – ongoing
- Amend Illinois School Code and administrative code, as necessary
- Implementation support for LEAs
- Continued reorganization of ISBE around ESSA
- Roll-out of IL-EMPOWER

ISBE provided information to the public during all phases of work to ensure that stakeholders had sufficient information about ESSA in order to provide meaningful feedback via the listening tours and submission of comments. ISBE maintained and updated an ESSA website all during the development of the ESSA State Plan to publicly post the timeline, resources, and additional information, including the draft plans.

Also, key policymakers, including members of the Illinois General Assembly, the P-20 Council, the IBAMC, and other stakeholder groups, met regularly and were informed of the progress of the development of the ESSA State Plan. These groups, in particular the P-20 Council and IBAMC, were integral in providing feedback and guidance in the development of all phases of the plan.

The drafts of the state plan have been presented to stakeholder groups through a wide array of venues with sufficient time to consider relevant comments prior to ISBE Board approval. ISBE received 280 public comments about Draft 1, which was open for comments for six weeks, and 369 public comments about Draft 2, which was also open for comment for six weeks. As indicated earlier, ISBE has hosted listening tours, conferences, one-on-one meetings, and other stakeholder meetings since January 2016. Please see Appendix D for the list of all stakeholder meetings related to ESSA.

The Governor's Office has been provided weekly updates throughout the process. The state plan was presented to the Governor's Office in February 2017 for comment during a required 30-day review. The State Board also has been receiving monthly updates and providing input throughout the year.

More specifically, ISBE held a series of listening tour meetings throughout 2016 to ensure that creation of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois included ample opportunity for stakeholders to share their expertise. Listening Tour Reports are available in their entirety on www.isbe.net/essa. District superintendents, school principals, teachers, policy advocates, parents, community members, and other stakeholders attended the listening tour

meetings.

The first listening tour in April and May had two objectives:

- To provide an overview of the new ESSA requirements and funding opportunities, and
- To gather feedback from education stakeholders about implementation of ESSA in Illinois.

The ESSA State Plan for Illinois Draft 1, which incorporated insights gained from the April/May tour, was released on August 25, 2016, for six weeks of public comment. The second listening tour occurred in September 2016 and focused on key issues contained within Draft 1. ISBE received more than 280 individual comments on Draft 1 via essa@isbe.net. Comments were submitted from 54 organizations, 70 students who advocated including the arts in ESSA, and 60 emails on behalf of library and media specialists. What follows is an identification of the larger categories in which comments were received on Draft 1 as well as general themes included within the submission.

General Comments:³²

- *Health and wellness:* Providing overall school wellness and whole child wellness within the school quality/student success indicators, including an assessment for health, physical education, and socio emotional learning, aggregate fitness scores, nutrition standards, integrated physical education into school day.
- *Title II funding:* Focus attention/resources on early grades, parent engagement, teacher residency programs, teacher leadership, teacher retention, English Learner issues that assist all teachers of ELs in implementing curricula, assessment measures and best practices and instructional strategies, support for students with disabilities, student needs, and supporting gifted children.
- *Supports for English Learners:* Native language assessments, adjusting the ACCESS proficiency score, growth in addition to EL proficiency, and formulating a former EL subgroup for purposes of accountability.
- *Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS):* Focus on leadership and supporting the whole child, incorporation of the after-school quality standards, use of the Illinois School Library Media Association Linking for Learning guidelines as part of MTSS, wellness centers in MTSS, opposition to MTSS in its current form unless it's fully funded, agreement with developing strong MTSS, and focus on parents/ guardians.

³² Please note, that those topics and areas identified are for the purposes of showing the range of comments received by ISBE.

- *Other comments:* Maintain foundational services³³, support professional learning communities, and create a gifted subgroup for the Report Card.
- *Student success/school quality indicators (support for):* Chronic absenteeism, pre-K suspension/expulsion rates, preK-K attendance, K-2, extracurricular and out-of-school activities, teacher retention rates, after-school activity, overall school wellness and whole child wellness, Kindergarten Individual Development Survey (KIDS) protocol with adjustments, work-based learning, socio emotional learning, and school climate.
- *Accountability:* Equity in funding must come before accountability, high school growth needed, and parent involvement linked with accountability that might include funding for parent involvement coordinator.

Comments Specific to the College and Career Ready Indicator:

- *GPA 2.8 out of 4.0:* Concerns about the diversity of teacher grading and that GPA looks different in every district, concern about “gaming the system,” schools are moving away from traditional grading methods (some schools use number systems [1-4] instead of grades), and about students taking easier classes to improve GPA.
- *Academic benchmark/industry credentials:* ZIP Code disparities, funding and staffing challenges, and required time to scale up.
- *Behavior and experiential benchmarks:* Coordination and oversight will require additional staff, students who work or with other obligations may not be able to meet experiential requirements, may be unfairly limiting for students with disabilities, support for 90 percent attendance and 25 hours community service, and the notion of attendance should be broadly considered.
- *Miscellaneous:* Ninety percent attendance may be problematic due to prolonged illness or family/caretaker obligation, creates six necessary conditions for college and career readiness, the plan creates numerous veto points for students to achieve readiness, the requirement should be college OR career, and the work proposed is too restrictive.
- *Additional ideas:* Inquiry-based skills; soft skills needed – add intelligence, collaboration, and social skills; and arts readiness.

Draft 2 was released on November 18 for six weeks of public comment. The third listening tour occurred in late November 2016 and focused on accountability issues contained

³³ Foundational Services are professional learning opportunities that focus on ISBE initiatives. They are delivered through Regional Offices of Education. During the 2016-17 school year, ELA, mathematics, teacher evaluation, balanced Assessment, and family and community engagement were delivered throughout Illinois.

within Draft 2. These comments and the Listening Tour Reports are available in their entirety at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/ESSA-Draft-Report.aspx>. Another 369 comments were submitted by 67 organizations. Within these comments, 145 were from individuals advocating to include the arts in ESSA; there were 21 emails from school library and media specialists.

What follows is an identification of the larger categories for which comments were received on Draft 2 as well as general themes included within the submission:

- *Health and wellness:* Providing overall school wellness and whole child wellness within the school quality/student success indicators, including an assessment for health, physical education, and socio emotional learning, aggregate fitness scores, nutrition standards, integrated physical education into school day.
- *Title II funding:* Subsidize bilingual education programs, micro-credentialing, competitive grants to teacher leaders, teacher wellness.
- *Supports for English Learners:* No more than 10-15 percent weighting for ELs in the accountability matrix, native language assessments, exit criteria: 5.0 composite score, five-year timeline and growth-to-proficiency model should be developed.
- *Student success/school quality indicators (support for):* Chronic absenteeism, physical fitness, school health index, social-worker-to-student ratio, school nurses – to –student ration, civics, arts, suspension/expulsion rates.
- *College and career ready:* Change labels, need pathway for students with disabilities.
- *Accountability:* Equity in funding must come before accountability, high school growth needed
- *Support for positive behavioral support:* (1) Ensure all Illinois schools have access to adequate technical assistance aligned to implement and sustain behavioral supports within an MTSS framework (2) use multiple measures for school climate (3) develop both state and LEA capacity for implementation, fidelity, and sustainability of supports and integrated evidence-based practices for district and schools.
- *Other:* Develop Parent Advisory Council at the state level, align ESSA with Perkins, align with early childhood education.
- *n-size:* Suggestions included an n-size between 10 and 30. Some comments just thanked ISBE for the recommendation of 20. Those who had other recommendations are captured by the following sentiments:
 - Raise the n-size to 30. The threshold of 30 for a subgroup is generally considered the minimum sample size for statistical analysis. Setting

subgroups smaller than that can result in less precise data. It is critical that subgroup data be statistically significant because the sample size in ESSA could play a big role for accountability purposes, including the determination of what districts are identified as needing targeted supports.

- Lower the n-size to 10: The current proposed n-size of 20 is a major improvement for Illinois, but there is concern that some subgroups in some schools would be overlooked if the n-size is larger. Commenters suggested it is too easy for schools in their efforts to balance the needs of the majority of the student population to lose sight of the unique needs of smaller populations of students.

Draft 3 was released on February 1 and presented to the Governor for review. While there was no official public comment period, ISBE received numerous comments on Draft 3. (These comments are available in their entirety at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/ESSA-Draft-Report.aspx>. A total of 760 comments were submitted. One hundred of those comments were from individuals advocating that (1) growth should count more than proficiency, (2) high expectations and outcomes for all students, especially those from historically underserved subgroups, be ensured, (3) summative designations should make sense to parents, and (4) creating the appropriate plan for Illinois is more important than completing it quickly. Arts Alliance Illinois, Ingenuity, and 682 individuals wrote that arts should be included as a distinct indicator of K–12 school quality.

Some of the other critical feedback received on Draft 3 include:

- *Summative Ratings:* Further discussion and review was requested for the system of designations that is described in Draft 3. There is concern that it does not appear that the plan addresses the performance of subgroups in a school's designation.
- *Weighting:* Commenters are still providing conflicting recommendations on the weighting of indicators, from “70/30 or above ...[because] aiming for a high standard will ensure that growth and outcomes are acknowledged and Illinois students can remain competitive among their peers³⁴” to “academic indicators weighted 51% overall while the school quality or student success indicators be weighted 49%.” “... Without sufficient and equitable funding, the overall weighting should not be overly reliant on standardized tests results tied to community poverty levels as the basis for both proficiency and growth measures in the state accountability system. When the state can demonstrate adequate and sufficient

³⁴ Illinois Chamber of Commerce Comments on Draft 3

funding for all schools, then we welcome the opportunity to revisit and reevaluate the overall weights.”³⁵

- *Subgroup size:* Again, there were conflicting recommendations on the subgroup size between 20 and 30.
- *Appendix H:* Accountability System Comparisons provide information on the different recommendations from IBAMC, ISBE, and the Governor’s Office.

In several instances, commenters sought clarification or more time on items. For example, questions surrounding the definition of college and career ready terms were identified. Lessons learned from past school improvement efforts were offered and request for collaboration in moving forward with the development of supports and interventions were requested. Several commenters requested the development of a High School Growth options.

- ii. Took into account the input obtained through consultation and public comment. The response must include both how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through consultation and public comment and any changes the SEA made as a result of consultation and public comment for all components of the consolidated state plan.

ISBE received 280 public comments from the first listening tour and 369 public comments from the second listening tour. The topics upon which stakeholders comments were generated are listed in a previous section of this document. Additionally, staff from the Midwest Comprehensive Center took formal notes from each of the listening tour meetings. These Listening Tour Reports are available in their entirety at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/ESSA.aspx>.

All comments received via essa@isbe.net and via the website were shared with relevant staff working on the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. The team reviewed and discussed the comments prior to drafting to determine how to incorporate comments.³⁶

What follows are a few examples of how comments have assisted ISBE in clarifying portions of the draft plans and that have strongly shaped the ESSA State Plan for Illinois through its development:

- College and career readiness: A framework was presented in Draft 1 that had three major components -- GPA, SAT, and two or more academic benchmarks or industry credentials. A suggestion from the field prompted the

³⁵ CTU-IFT Comments on Draft 3

³⁶ Many of the comments received focused on the implementation of the state plan and will be more appropriately developed through guidance developed by ISBE beginning in the first quarter of 2017.

incorporation of an alternative College and Career Pathway into Draft 2 to further assist in clarifying this indicator. This is testimony to the involvement of the community in the process, the responsiveness to accepting new ideas in the draft, and the time we have invested in allowing for community engagement to allow for this important dialogue to occur.

- Chronic absenteeism: There was interest at an early accountability stakeholder meeting in chronic absenteeism as a student success/school quality indicator. Numerous stakeholders have submitted comments in support of this indicator³⁷. ISBE heard support at meetings for this indicator as a proven early warning sign of academic risk and of the likelihood a student will drop out of school. The definition of chronic absenteeism is being developed by the Attendance Commission.
- Accountability: The development of the accountability system, including identification and weighting of the included indicators, was heavily informed by the accountability working group³⁸, the technical steering committee, recommendations of the IBAMC, and the P-20 Council, as well as the statements submitted during public comment periods and during the listening tour meetings. Not all indicators recommended were able to be included, predominantly because they did not meet one or more of the technical criteria required in ESSA (e.g., being valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state, capable of being disaggregated for each student demographic group, supported by research that high performance or improvement is likely to increase student learning, or will aid in the meaningful differentiation of schools).
- Exit criteria for comprehensive and targeted supports: The exit criteria for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement were expanded to include a trajectory for student achievement and a strong plan for sustainability based on feedback provided during the first period of public comment by the Consortium for Educational Change.

³⁷ Healthy Schools Campaign, Illinois Alliance to Prevent Obesity, Ounce of Prevention, Action for Children, Action for Healthy Kids.

³⁸ The accountability working group included representation from the Illinois Association of School Administrators, Advance Illinois, Illinois Federation of Teachers, Illinois Education Association, Leadership and Education in Neurodevelopmental and Related Disabilities, SCOPE, ED-Red, Large Unit District Association, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents, Stand for Children, Latino Policy Forum, Illinois Parent Teacher Association, Chicago Public Schools District 299, Chicago Teachers Union, Illinois Network of Charter Schools, General Assembly staff, members of the General Assembly, Governor's Office, and Secretary of Education's Office.

- Fine arts: Numerous commenters indicated they believed the fine arts should be included in ESSA, but in many cases did not specify what this could mean (e.g., some commentators only suggested that the fine arts are important whereas others mentioned a fine arts indicator should be included within the accountability system).
- School library and media specialists: School library and media specialists were present at almost every listening tour meeting across the state and submitted numerous comments expressing the value that licensed school library and media specialists provide to schools, classrooms, and students. ISBE will include language in the Title I District Plans that asks districts “how they will identify and address disparities in library resources.”

Additional information on the listening tours and comments feedback are above and throughout this document.

- C. Governor’s consultation.** Describe how the SEA consulted in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor consistent with section 8540 of the ESEA, including whether officials from the SEA and the Governor’s Office met during the development of this plan and prior to the submission of this plan.

Staff from ISBE and the Governor’s Office met weekly regarding the ESSA State Plan for Illinois in its various drafts prior to sharing Draft 3 with the Governor on February 1, 2017. Relevant topics discussed in these meetings included updates on the status of the plan, areas of the plan where concerns and questions had been identified by the Governor’s Office or other stakeholders, and the various avenues through which feedback was elicited.

Date SEA provided the plan to the Governor: 2/1/2017

Check one:

- ☐ The Governor signed this consolidated state plan.
☐ The Governor did not sign this consolidated state plan.

2.2 System of Performance Management.

Instructions: In the text boxes below, each SEA must describe consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.15 (b) its system of performance management of SEA and LEA plans across all programs included in this consolidated state plan. The description of an SEA’s system of performance management must include information on the SEA’s review and approval of LEA plans, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance across the components of the consolidated state plan.

- A. Review and Approval of LEA Plans.** Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, review, and approval of LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The description should include a discussion of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with: 1) the specific needs of the LEA, and 2) the SEA’s consolidated state plan.

The purpose of ESSA is to provide all children a significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and to close educational achievement gaps.

This expanded focus reaches beyond the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics foci of NCLB to help provide a better chance of closing the achievement gap. ISBE has engaged in significant monitoring and provided technical assistance in the predecessor programs, but is now using ESSA as an opportunity to better coordinate monitoring between divisions and provide differentiated technical assistance in order to support LEAs in their work.

ISBE is expected to receive more than \$1 billion in ESSA funds to distribute to its 855 districts through the various programs. To facilitate this process, ISBE staff are developing the required statutory plans for each program and updating the grant applications for the districts to access. The grant application portal will open to districts in the late winter or early spring of 2017.

The development of these plans and applications are driven by (1) stakeholder consultation on the local level and (2) data-driven decision-making. Applications and plans are developed through consultation with districts, staff, and design experts. Elements within the plans and grant applications are based on supporting data. ISBE staff share this information in the spring of each year by creating guidance documents, having in-person meetings with Title I directors throughout the state, and holding webinars.

Review of applications is critical to ensure LEAs’ activities align with both the needs of the LEA identified in their respective plans and within the greater ESSA State Plan for Illinois as well as with statutory and regulatory requirements for each program area. Staff at ISBE provide support to districts throughout this process.

To the extent possible, divisions are consolidating and coordinating their work regarding applications.³⁹ This coordination minimizes work on behalf of the district, helps to accelerate ISBE’s

³⁹ For example, questions from the Title I Plan will be imported into the Consolidated Application to support the budgeting process. Question #6, “describe the services provided to homeless students” will be imported into the Title I application and used to evaluate the amount of money set aside for homeless students. So, too, the application will require districts to explain how they support the transition of children from one school or the home to a school or postsecondary opportunity.

application-approval process, and creates alignment between the plans and the application. Moreover, during the first half of 2017, ISBE is engaging in work with Fellows from the Kellogg School of Business in order to better coordinate monitoring within and between divisions for the purpose of providing better, more targeted services to districts.

ISBE is utilizing ESSA to remodel the internal organization of the agency. Divisions are coordinating professional development to districts to support application and plan development and implementation. For example, the Title Grants Administration Division (overseeing Title I, II, IV) coordinates training with Federal and State Monitoring in order to ensure that programmatic and fiscal requirements are meeting the law and, more importantly, supporting the work of educators in serving students. This work will allow ISBE to better coordinate application requirements, monitoring throughout the year, using the data submitted by districts to ensure return on investment as well as share promising practices throughout the state.⁴⁰

The significant involvement of all agency staff in the creation of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois as well as the plan's strong connections to the field via stakeholder meetings will lead to valuable coordination between the ESSA State Plan for Illinois and ISBE plan initiatives. Any particular LEA plan to ensure a feedback loop includes compliance with the law, actionable suggestions for modification or amending an LEA plan (when applicable), and supports for implementation.

- B. Monitoring.** Describe the SEA's plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of the included programs to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information, which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on state and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.
- C.** Monitoring ESSA programs is a joint and collaborative process at ISBE. Fiscal and administrative monitoring of the ESSA programs is primarily performed by the staff of the Federal and State Monitoring Division at ISBE. This review includes both desk auditing of data supplied by districts as well as on-site visits by division staff. Districts are chosen for fiscal monitoring through an annual risk-based selection process using various data inputs, such as the amount and type of funding received, overall financial status, and number of prior issues noted during reviews or audits. All grant recipients must annually complete an internal control questionnaire that is included as a piece of the overall risk assessment. Stakeholder input from ISBE program employees, district

⁴⁰ Put differently, creating a more coherent approach that considers the information asked within the application and deliberately tying this to monitoring and outcomes, will assist ISBE in refining the supports it provides to the field in this work.

employees, and community members is included in the risk assessment, as appropriate. Programmatic monitoring is conducted within each program area, such as monitoring within the School Improvement Grant or within the Title Grants Division. Programmatic monitoring activities are determined by the employees who work closely with the grant recipients in order to maximize monitoring resources within ISBE. ISBE is continuing to consider ways in which monitoring could serve as an opportunity to revisit and refine practices. For instance, during the first half of 2017, ISBE is engaging in work with Fellows from the Kellogg School of Business in order to better coordinate monitoring within and between divisions for the purpose of providing better, more targeted services to districts. This work includes meeting with districts to hear perceptions and recommendations in order to create a system that best serves districts.⁴¹

Further, Illinois has adopted the principals included in the [Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards \(2 CFR Part 200\)](#) for all grants made by the state as either the originator or as a pass-through entity via the [Grant Accountability and Transparency Act \(GATA\)](#) (30 ILCS 708/1). The purpose of GATA is to increase accountability and transparency in the use of grant funds while reducing the administrative burden on both state agencies and grantees. The law provides for the development of a coordinated, non-redundant process to establish effective and efficient oversight of the selection and monitoring of grant recipients, ensuring quality programs; limiting fraud, waste, and abuse; and defining the purpose, scope, applicability, and responsibilities in the life cycle of a grant. Fiscal, administrative, and programmatic monitoring protocols are being developed and formalized statewide in an effort to adopt best practices, create efficiencies, and improve outcomes. The requirements of GATA as well as Budgeting for Results⁴² (BFR) and Illinois Data for Fiscal and Instructional Results, Study, and Transparency (Illinois Data FIRST⁴³) provide ISBE with the opportunity to collect and share data on program efficacy in two ways. First, data collected from LEAs on accountability indicators will be shared on the Illinois State Report Card. Additional information on specific program outcomes, through the requirements of BFR, will be shared internally and with stakeholders in order to, as applicable, refine program goals and allocation requests.

⁴¹ ISBE appreciates the Latino Policy Forum sharing that “[s]chool district staff found the on-site monitoring of EL programs to be effective for overall improvement of EL programs when conducted by ISBE qualified staff.”

⁴² For additional information on Budgeting for Results, please access <https://www.illinois.gov/hsc/Documents/BFR%20Strategic%20Plan%204-27-12.pdf> and <https://www.illinois.gov/gov/budget/Pages/results.aspx>.

⁴³ For additional information on the Illinois Longitudinal Data System, please access <https://www.illinoisworknet.com/ILDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

The ISBE Internal Audit Division will audit the agency's compliance with the rules of ESSA and GATA. Internal Audit provides independent and objective assurance and advisory services directed toward evaluating the effectiveness of internal risk management, control, and governance.

D. Continuous Improvement. Describe the SEA's plan to continuously improve SEA and LEA plans and implementation. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information, which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on state and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.

Most generally, various sources of data (e.g., data collected through the LEA application, program targets, Report Card, etc.) will be used for the purposes of continuous improvement by both ISBE and the LEAs. ISBE will analyze the submission and approval process for applications to collect data from LEAs and compile lists of best practices and frequently asked questions. ISBE's outreach efforts will ensure that stakeholders within and outside of the agency are aware of the support they have to implement practices that will improve outcomes for children.

More specifically, ISBE shall use data from the state and local Report Cards as well as feedback from stakeholders to evaluate needs for programmatic technical assistance. Other data points may also be used, such as issues within the application process and monitoring findings. For example, in Title I other factors considered when determining where to target technical assistance include:

- a) Years of experience of the program director in administering the Title I program
- b) How current is the district's Title I plan
- c) District's responsiveness to communications from ISBE regarding submission of its application and response to ISBE's review findings
- a) Size of Title I allocation
- b) Number of Federal and State Monitoring audit findings
- c) Number of A-133 Reports
- d) Budget variances (net disbursement to budget comparison of Title I grant)
- e) Any complaints made against the district

Currently, each program area has unique indicators that drive the technical assistance determinations. ISBE's goal is to use its personnel resources to provide technical assistance and capacity building to districts to meet the goals of ESSA in a comprehensive manner. Thus, ISBE is using the opportunity presented by ESSA to look more holistically as an agency at how our divisions overlap and can work together to improve efficiency and reduce burdens on districts and to

improve services to students. And, while there are standardized approaches within divisions to ensure compliance, ISBE is also sensitive to the differentiated needs of districts.

ISBE will maximize effective use of ESSA funds by:

- Coordinating new plans and resources available with pre-existing resources and programs, leveraging on the knowledge of previous programs and expanding on the new opportunities provided under ESSA;
- Monitoring the implementation of activities and programs through its existing district oversight mechanisms and coordinating with other programs to minimize the burden on districts;
- Offering technical assistance to districts to help them in implementing approved program activities and tie fiscal decisions to improved student achievement;
- Providing technical assistance, professional development, and support to LEAs and schools in the development of their planning and application for comprehensive funding across programs; and
- Providing assistance or conducting a needs assessment, curriculum audits, equity audits, and other diagnostic supports and services for LEAs and schools necessary to develop strong improvement plans.

E. Differentiated Technical Assistance. Describe the SEA's plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies.

ISBE, as an agency, is transitioning toward cross-functional teams. As the ESSA State Plan for Illinois has developed, staff from different divisions have come together to consider how ISBE can most appropriately be organized in order to serve the field. Undergirding this work is the ISBE vision that states *Illinois is a state of whole, healthy children nested in whole, healthy systems supporting communities wherein all citizens are socially and economically secure*. In order to operationalize that vision, schools and districts -- like the children they serve -- must have available to them differentiated supports based upon identified needs and readiness. This occurs in two ways.

First, ISBE staff is available to support districts by responding to questions about technical matters (e.g., how to complete a grant application, the appropriate use of funds). Included in this work is fiscal and programmatic monitoring.

Second, ISBE will provide access to supports identified as necessary by a district or school through IL-EMPOWER.

As the statewide system of support to help all districts and schools improve, IL-EMPOWER will provide the *structure* through which schools will be able to select an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner(s) and receive services. The structure of IL-EMPOWER is predicated on schools identifying areas where they need support as well schools selecting a vendor who can best assist in meeting those areas of need to improve student outcomes. Prior to identifying and utilizing an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, a school must complete a needs assessment/equity audit. The audit is required and is the basis for all future work. The results of the audit will allow schools to select the most appropriate provider for their needs, establish a work plan identifying targets, as well as create a timeline to meet improvement targets. Targets must be identified in one or more of the following areas: Governance and Management, Curriculum and Instruction, and Climate and Culture.

ISBE will monitor the school's improvement plans to ensure that they are on track to meet improvement targets or, if a school is not meeting performance targets, assist in amending improvement plans to focus specifically on areas inhibiting improvement.

The IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner will be pre-approved by ISBE to offer particular services at a specific cost. ISBE will work with vendors to establish the specific cost for services so that schools and Provider Partners will not need to do so. Schools will have four years in which to demonstrate consistent improvement in identified areas (one year for planning and three years for implementation).⁴⁴

In order to serve as an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, an organization must apply and be pre-approved to offer services in one or more of the aforementioned categories. Applicants for pre-approval must provide:

- Evidence of success in the delivery and sustainability of school improvement services.
- Information on or evidence of the development of services in areas including, but not limited to, Data Competency, Resource Management, Continuous Improvement, and Sustainability.
- Information on organizational capacity.

Once pre-approval of vendors occurs and after schools are identified for supports in 2018-2019 school year, the next steps for a school identified for comprehensive support are:

1. Upon notification from ISBE will begin completing a needs assessment/equity audit.

⁴⁴ The determination for a four-year timeframe was recommended by stakeholders (one year of planning, three for implementation) as well as is the greatest length of time allowed for this work in ESSA.

2. At the conclusion of the needs assessment/equity audit, the school shall submit the data gleaned from the needs assessment/equity audit along with the identification of vendors who could support the school with its identified needs or equity gaps to ISBE.
3. ISBE will ensure that the identified vendor⁴⁵ has the capacity to assist the school.⁴⁶
4. The school and vendor will develop a work plan that includes targets and dates and submit to ISBE for approval.

95% of TI funds identified for school improvement must flow to the districts. The supports identified through the needs assessment and equity audit as well as the cost proposal submitted as part of the pre-approval process will allow ISBE to grant the appropriate amount of funding to each school or district.⁴⁷ ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of quarterly reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets as well as utilizing field-based staff who can, if necessary, provide technical assistance and monitor for compliance. Schools that are not making reasonable progress will work directly with ISBE to determine additional interventions.⁴⁸

Member of the Illinois State Board of Education will be provided an annual report that including evidence of provider impact before any renewal is approved.

⁴⁵ As identified in the introduction to the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, there is the possibility, within the IL-EMPOWER structure, that schools and districts within Illinois can serve as partners for schools that require support. Schools that have received a Tier I - Exemplary School or Tier II – Commendable School can engage in this work and receive funding to do so. As indicated by Superintendent Smith at the February 2017 Illinois State Board of Education meeting, peer coaching and mentoring will grow as ESSA implementation continues.

⁴⁶ To be clear, it may be that a pre-approved vendor is working with a number of schools. At the time of a specific schools submission of information/data to ISBE, that vendor may be at capacity based upon the information submitted at the time of application. If this is the case, ISBE will work with the school to identify another appropriate vendor.

⁴⁷ The IL-EMPOWER structure allows for the selection of a vendor to serve multiple schools within the same region. Approaching the work in this way assumes that schools have identified the same needs and similar targets.

⁴⁸ Within the IL-EMPOWER structure, a Tier 4: Lowest Performing School would not be able to be identified for comprehensive services indefinitely. At the same time, the type of intervention would be dependent on the specific elements within the improvement plan that, over time, were not met. In the case of a school receiving comprehensive services that is unable to meet targets, ISBE will work directly with the school to determine the necessary supports and resources outside the IL-EMPOWER structure that will aid in school improvement.

Section 3: Academic Assessments

Instructions: As applicable, provide the information regarding a state's academic assessments in the text boxes below.

Currently, and as required in ESSA, Illinois has an assessment system that includes:

- Content assessments in grades 3 through 8 in ELA and mathematics.
- Administration of the SAT at no cost to 11th- grade students on a school day.
- A science assessment completed by students in grades 5, 8, and at the conclusion of Biology I in high school.
- The Dynamic Learning Maps Alternative Assessment for those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

In line with the opportunities presented within ESSA, ISBE endeavors to use assessment as an opportunity to ensure that each and every child is able to demonstrate academic achievement on state standards. However, while ISBE acknowledges that strong academic achievement is essential for each and every child, it is also the case that academic achievement is but one portion of a more complex picture of student development over time. ESSA requires an accountability system containing multiple measures. Thus, in addition to academic achievement, ISBE must collect and report on growth for students in grades 3 through 8. Stakeholders and the Governor have also made it clear that growth, while not required in ninth through 12th grades, is very important and should be included in the accountability system.

A. Advanced Mathematics Coursework. Does the state: 1) administer end-of-course mathematics assessments to high school students in order to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA; and 2) use the exception for students in eighth grade to take such assessments under section 1111(b)(2)(C) of the ESEA?

☒ Yes. If yes, describe the SEA's strategies to provide all students in the state the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4).

☐ No.

The state is continuing to actively support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards in mathematics in a manner that responds to students' areas of strength and builds educator capacity to effectively differentiate instruction for students. ISBE is pursuing issues related to licensure and endorsement, as well as virtual opportunities for students; to ensure that qualified staff is available to each and every student to pursue advanced coursework in middle school.

B. Languages other than English. Describe how the SEA is complying with the requirements in section 1111(b)(2)(F) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f) in languages other than English.

- i. Provide the SEA's definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4), and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

ISBE defines languages other than English, present to a significant extent in Illinois' student population, as any world language spoken by more than 60 percent of English Learners in the state.

This accounts for over 91 percent of all English Learners in the state based on the most recent verified data (2014). ISBE provides translation of directions and reporting shells within the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment. The PARCC table in Appendix E shows the 10 languages in Illinois during the last three school years (2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16).⁴⁹ The estimate of the 2015-16 Illinois count is identical to the counts for 2014-15.

- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

The only language that is currently being trans-adapted is Spanish for the PARCC assessment in mathematics.

- iii. Indicate the languages other than English identified in B.i. above for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

The PARCC mathematics assessment has been trans-adapted for Spanish; however, additional development and validation is necessary in all other areas and for other languages. Illinois will, to the greatest extent practicable, work to develop translations for all languages where 30 percent or more of the English Learner population speaks the same language, other than English.

- iv. Describe how the SEA will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population by providing:

1. The state's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4);

The state will continue work with stakeholders to identify all possible funding streams and technical resources to support this work. It is anticipated that we will continue to offer a trans-adapted version of mathematics for the 3-8 general education assessment and that we will seek to extend this opportunity to other content areas and assessment.⁵⁰ The goal is to provide translations for all languages where 30 percent or more of the English Learner population speaks the same world language, other than English. However, Illinois capacity

⁴⁹ Chinese Mandarin is listed as a top 4 language in Illinois on the PARCC list. Chinese has two languages: Mandarin and Cantonese. When the two languages are counted together, the combination is in the top 4. Please note that Illinois counts these two languages separately.

⁵⁰ Stakeholders have requested native language assessments for PARCC language arts for at least the Spanish speaking subgroup which takes into account 78% of all ELs in Illinois.

to do this work will depend on a sufficient allocation from both federal and state sources to conduct the translations and validate the work.

2. A description of the process the state used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English Learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

ISBE's strategy to ensure that opportunities for meaningful consultation with stakeholders was formulated in three ways. First, ISBE provided information to the public to ensure that stakeholders had sufficient information about ESSA in order to provide meaningful feedback via the listening tours. ISBE maintained and updated an ESSA website throughout the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois to publicly post the timeline, resources, and additional information, including the draft plan. Second, key policymakers, including members of the Illinois General Assembly, ISBE, the P-20 Council, IBAMC, and other stakeholder groups, met regularly and were informed of the progress of the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. These groups, in particular the P-20 Council and IBAMC, were integral in providing feedback and guidance in the development of all phases of the plan. Finally, the draft plan has been presented to many stakeholder groups through a wide array of venues prior to ISBE Board approval with sufficient time to consider relevant comments. Please see Appendix D for the list of all stakeholder meetings related to ESSA.

ISBE included information in all three phases on specific provisions related to English Learners and assessments in languages other than English and solicited comments and consulted with stakeholders representing constituencies serving bilingual committees. The Latino Policy Forum and Bilingual Advisory Council, among others, have been deeply involved in the work of the P-20 Council and IBAMC and have contributed to the development of the plan.

3. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the state has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

ISBE is committed to developing native language content areas exams. However, funding has been a barrier to completing any additional development of native language or content translations. Illinois has not had a full budget in two fiscal years, though K-12 education has been funded during this time. However, the ongoing fiscal uncertainty regarding a full budget has made it difficult to identify state funding for the development of native language or content translations.

Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

4.1 Accountability System.

As mentioned previously, school accountability in ESSA requires that a state consider more than academic achievement in grades 3 through 12. Also, while ESSA requires that the accountability system of a state include academic proficiency, it also requires the following:

- Academic growth (Grades 3 through 8);
- Graduation rate (High School);
- EL proficiency (Grades 3 through 12); and
- One or more student quality or student success indicator.

The area that received the greatest attention during the listening tours and via public comments on drafts of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois was the development of an educative, equitable, and non-punitive accountability system. Common values held by ISBE and stakeholders also include high expectations for student achievement (i.e., the required academic indicators) and a system that captures the complexity of the work that occurs in schools. ISBE asserted that growth and achievement should be weighted equally in the first two drafts of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. However, public comment and comments received from the Governor during the required 30-day review provided a strong argument that growth was of greater importance than that of proficiency. Rationale for this claim was premised upon the former accountability system in NCLB insofar as there were a number of schools whose students were showing growth. Neither the accountability system nor the Illinois School Report Card reflected this growth. Additionally, the ability for stakeholders to identify accountability indicators that extended beyond achievement and growth provide an opportunity to develop a system in which multiple measures indicative of the work that occurs in schools could be factored into a final summative designation for each school. The system outlined below contains both of the aforementioned -- growth weighted significantly higher than proficiency and school quality and school success indicators that look at aspects of schooling that were previously unavailable to the Illinois accountability system under NCLB.

Thus, the accountability system for Illinois as well as the weights within and between the required academic category and schools quality/student success indicator are as follows:⁵¹

Category	Elementary	High School
Core Academic Indicators = 75%	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)

⁵¹ Appendix H: Accountability System Comparisons provide information on the different recommendations from IBAMC, ISBE, and the Governor's Office.

	Math Proficiency – 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	Math Proficiency 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)
	Science Proficiency – 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)	Science Proficiency – 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)
	ELA and Math Growth -50% (simple linear regression)	Graduation/ELA and Math Growth - 50% (simple linear regression)
	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to target treatment)	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to target treatment)
School Quality Indicators = 25%	Chronic Absenteeism – 10%	Chronic Absenteeism – 7.5%
	Climate Surveys – 5%	Climate Surveys - 5%
	Fine Arts Indicator – 0% ⁵²	Fine Arts Indicator – 0%
	[Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator] – 5%	9 th Grade On-Track - 6.25%
	[P-2 Indicator] – 5%	College and Career Readiness - 6.25%

It is important to note that:

- Implementation of the accountability system will begin in 2017-18.

⁵² The Fine Arts Indicator will include participation of students in fine arts courses as identified in the Student Information System (SIS). For the next four-years, data for the fine arts will serve as the foundation for exploring if a more nuanced indicator and/or weighted indicator can be developed for inclusion in future iterations of the accountability system.

- The n-size for the purpose of accountability will be 20.
- Until such a time when indicators identified parenthetically are available, the total weight of the school quality/school success indicator will be placed upon the available indicator(s) for the school configuration.
- Based upon feedback from stakeholders and the Governor, growth received over two times as much weight as proficiency in the accountability system.
- Stakeholders and ISBE value having an accountability system that recognizes academic growth in high school, and the Governor is committed to providing these assessments to high schools.⁵³
- Insofar as growth receives over twice as much weight as attainment in the accountability system, ISBE will provide each school with a growth designation on the Illinois Report Card beginning in the 2019-2020 school year. This designation will provide parents, caregivers, and community members additional information on the interrelationship between growth and attainment as well as highlight those schools that have made substantial gains in growth. There will be a comparison of like schools and an all school comparison on annual growth to proficiency. In both cases, the assigned grade for growth will use an A-F scale. The different levels for the growth designation will be determined by the Technical Advisory Council.
- EL proficiency will be measured by a growth to target measure,⁵⁴ based upon the recommendation of stakeholders.
- English Learners will be assessed annually for English proficiency and for English language arts and mathematics. Illinois will assess newly arrived ELs, enrolled in their first year in U.S. schools, in grades 3-12 in academic content areas: English language arts, mathematics, and science. Data from the first-year assessments will not be included in accountability determination, but serve solely for baseline purposes.
- Science has been included as an academic indicator insofar as a level of science literacy is important and an area in which Illinois' students are currently required to be assessed. The science indicator will be weighted at 0 percent until 2019-20. The weight of the science indicator will increase to 5 percent during the 2019-20 school year and the weight of ELA and math will decrease to 7.5 percent.

⁵³ However, until a means of measuring growth is established in grades 9-12, ISBE recommends comparing 9th grade on-track by cohort to graduation rate. Schools that have 90% or greater of 9th-grade students on-track and, in four years, graduate 90% or more of those students will receive the highest designation. Schools in which the graduation rate is below 67% will be eligible for comprehensive services and receive the designation indicating this eligibility regardless of the percentage of the 9th-grade cohort on-track.

⁵⁴ The Illinois School Report Card will indicate EL growth using the following descriptors: schools making better than expected growth, schools making adequate growth, and schools making less than adequate growth.

Student scores will be reported only in respects to proficiency due to the federal requirements that frame the administration of this assessment.

- The Fine Arts have been included as a school quality/student success indicator. This indicator will consider the percentage of students enrolled in a fine arts course during the school year. It will receive 0% for the next four school years. During that time a workgroup will analyze available data to ascertain if/how the indicator can be further refined.
- Illinois will use simple linear regression (e.g., current year test scores are regressed on last year's test scores), based upon the recommendation of IBAMC. ISBE supports the recommendations of the Technical Steering Committee and will run additional statistical treatments (e.g., growth to target, value tables, student growth percentiles, hybrid models) concurrently on this data. This information will allow the Technical Advisory Council (TAC) to make the most informed choice on a growth measure at the conclusion of the 2019-20 school year.
- TAC provides guidance on technical assessment and accountability issues in an effort to create a single summative designation that meaningfully differentiates schools. TAC members help ensure alignment of accountability system to core values and assure the statistical validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness of individual assessments or indicators and the accountability system as a whole. TAC will be convened in collaboration with the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment and composed of national and local researchers and other practitioners, particularly those practitioners who specialize in assessment and school accountability research and data analysis for Illinois school districts.
- Indicators in [brackets] will be studied by workgroups organized by ISBE. Recommendations will be submitted no later than December 31, 2017.
- The realities of the fiscal uncertainty in Illinois as well as the need to revise how the state's schools are funded led to the creation of the Illinois School Funding Reform Commission. The commissioners agreed to include a spending transparency report that communicates federal, state, and local spending in a way that is understandable to the average person on the Illinois State Report Card. Such a report should give details of both district- and school-level spending, including for the purposes of examining intra-district equity. In addition, the state accountability system recommended through ESSA will be used to determine whether or not increased funding leads to improved student outcomes, specifically in terms of students' academic growth. ISBE will investigate any district that is receiving

increased investment with no improvement or a decline in outcomes. Depending on the results of the inquiry, the State Board may intervene and support the district.⁵⁵

- A. Indicators.** Describe the measure(s) included in each of the academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rate, progress in achieving English language proficiency, and school quality or student success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)-(b) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA.
- The description for each indicator should include how it is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state, as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c).
 - To meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(d), for the measures included within the indicators of academic progress and school quality or student success measures, the description must also address how each measure within the indicators is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework).
 - For measures within indicators of school quality or student success that are unique to high school, the description must address how research shows that high performance or improvement on the indicator is likely to increase graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, persistence, completion, or career readiness.
 - To meet the requirement in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e), the descriptions for the academic progress and school quality or student success indicators must include a demonstration of how each measure aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 by demonstrating varied results across schools in the state.

⁵⁵ Additional information on the Funding Commission may be found at <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Illinois-School-Funding-Reform-Commission.aspx>.

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
i. Academic Achievement	PARCC (3-8) Dynamic Learning Maps-Alternate Assessment (DLM-AA) (3-8, 11) SAT (high school)	P-8: 20% (ELA 10% - until 2019-20, then 7.5%) (Math 10% until 2019-20, then 7.5%) 9-12: 20% (ELA 10% - until 2019-20, then 7.5%)	<p>Description: The measure of academic achievement for grades 3-8 will be the PARCC assessment. The measure of academic achievement for high school will be the SAT, administered in grade 11. Additionally, the DLM-AA will be the measure of academic achievement for students with profound cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Research: PARCC: Many studies were conducted during the test development for PARCC to support the evidence for validity (e.g., Postsecondary Educators' Judgment Study, Performance Level Setting), reliability (e.g., Automated Scoring Study, Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study), and comparability (e.g., Mode Comparability Study, PARCC Benchmarking Study) for PARCC assessments. The technical reports for the field test in 2014 and the operational test in 2015 also documented the evidence for its validity, reliability, and comparability⁵⁶.</p> <p>SAT: The College Board sustains a continuous program of research on the SAT, examining the validity, fairness, and effectiveness of the test nationally. Extensive research on the predictive validity of the SAT has established its use as a college entrance exam through studies on the relationship between SAT score and first-year GPA in college. The College Board has also studied the relationship between SAT scores</p>

⁵⁶ For research on PARCC, please access at <http://www.parcconline.org/assessments/test-design/research>.

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
		(Math 10% until 2019-20, then 7.5%)	<p>and other critical postsecondary outcomes, such as college enrollment persistence, GPA in second and third year, as well as graduation rate. The redesign of the SAT assures that the predictive validity of the test is as strong as it was in the past⁵⁷.</p> <p>DLM-AA: The DLM consortium has sustained a research agenda based on the validity, reliability, and technical soundness of the DLM-AA as an appropriate large-scale assessment for students with the most profound cognitive disabilities.^{58 59}</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:</p> <p>Academic achievement has been the historical method for differentiation of schools. In the past, academic achievement was the only indicator used to meaningfully differentiate schools in Illinois. Thus, evidence that this indicator contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state will be provided when sufficient</p>

⁵⁷ For research on SAT, please access <http://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2014/6/Synthesis-of-Recent-SAT-Validity-Findings.pdf>.

⁵⁸ For research on DLM, please access http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/publication/Validity_Evidence_AA_Score_Uses_NCME2016_Karvonen_Romine_Clark.pdf.

⁵⁹ For research on the validity and reliability of DLM, please access http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/publication/Technical_Manual_IM_2014-15.pdf.

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
			baseline data across all indicators is available and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council. ⁶⁰
ii. Academic Progress	Linear Regression	P-8: 50%	<p>Description: The State of Illinois proposes to utilize linear regression (i.e., current test scores are regressed on last year's test scores) to compute student academic growth in grades 3-8, in concert with the recommendation from IBAMC. The state will concurrently run simulations of additional growth models as data becomes more stable with additional years of administration. If simulations show a more valid and reliable growth metric for purposes of meaningful differentiation, they will be considered by staff and stakeholders for utilization moving forward.</p> <p>Research: Illinois utilized the following resources on the appropriateness of various growth models for the purposes of accountability: The Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models⁶¹ and Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds</p>

⁶⁰ A Technical Advisory Council (TAC) provides guidance on technical assessment and accountability issues. TAC members help ensure alignment of accountability system to core values, and assure the statistical validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness of individual assessments or indicators and the accountability system as a whole. The TAC will be convened in collaboration with the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment and composed of national and local researchers and other practitioners, particularly those practitioners who specialize in assessment and school accountability research and data analysis for Illinois school districts.

⁶¹ This document can be accessed at: www.ccsso.org/documents/2013growthmodels.pdf

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
			<p>Act⁶². These resources are grounded in research⁶³ and evaluation⁶⁴ on past implementation of growth models as a part of accountability under NCLB.</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools: Evidence that this indicator contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state under the new accountability system will be provided when sufficient baseline data is available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.</p>
iii. Graduation Rate ⁶⁵	4-year adjusted cohort graduation	9-12: 50% ⁶⁶	Description: Illinois collects data regarding the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 5- and 6-year adjusted graduation rates.

⁶² https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Pathways_New-Accountability_Through_Every_Student_Succeeds_Act_04202016.pdf

⁶³ Beimers, Jennifer Nicole. The effects of model choice and subgroup on decisions in accountability systems based on student growth. ProQuest, 2008.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Understanding and Using Achievement Growth Data. Growth Model Brochure Series. (June 2011): http://www.wera-web.org/links/Journal/June_Journal_2012/CC6_CCSSO_Growth_Brochures_jan2012.pdf

Tekwe, Carmen D., Randy L. Carter, Chang-Xing Ma, James Algina, Maurice E. Lucas, Jeffrey Roth, Mario Ariet, Thomas Fisher, and Michael B. Resnick. 2004. "An Empirical Comparison of Statistical Models for Value-Added Assessment of School Performance." Journal Of Educational And Behavioral Statistics 29, no. 1: 11-36. ERIC, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2017).

⁶⁴ U.S. Department of Education. Evaluation of the 2005–06 Growth Model Pilot Program. (January 2009): <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/gmeval0109.doc>.

⁶⁵ ESSA does not require that growth is measured in grades 9 – 12. However, Illinois stakeholders have made it clear that a way of measuring growth is important and P20 recommended that the administration of a second high school assessment is the most accurate way to achieve this. Moreover, the

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
	rate, 5-year adjusted graduation rate, and 6-year adjusted graduation rate.		<p>Research: This data is stable and collected consistently across all LEAs serving high school grades, as can be seen in the School Report Card: 15-Year Statewide Trend Data⁶⁷. The definition and criteria for high school graduation are set in School Code⁶⁸, and the data collected statewide is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state, as evidenced in the Illinois State Report Card.</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools: Graduation rate is a required metric of student achievement. The maximum high school adjusted cohort graduation rate is 100%. The all students graduation rate in 2016 is 85.5% for 4-year, 87.7% for 5-year, and 88.2% for 6-year adjusted rates. Evidence that this indicator contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state under the new accountability system will be provided when sufficient baseline data is</p>

Governor's proposal places the greatest value on student growth. In order to measure this, the state must invest in a yearly high school assessment. Governor Rauner will commit to finding the funds to pay for this assessment.

⁶⁶ Until a means of measuring growth is established in grades 9-12, ISBE recommends comparing 9th grade on-track by cohort to graduation rate. Schools that have 90% or greater of 9th-grade students on-track and, in four years, graduate 90% or more of those students will receive the highest designation. Schools in which the graduation rate is below 67% will be eligible for comprehensive services and receive the designation indicating this eligibility regardless of the percentage of the ninth-grade cohort on-track.

⁶⁷ Information retrieved from: https://www.isbe.net/_layouts/Download.aspx?SourceUrl=/Documents/rc-trend-data-02-16.xlsx

⁶⁸ For required high school graduation criteria, please see the Illinois School Code 105 ILCS 5/27-22, 27-22.05, 27-22.10

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
			available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.
iv. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	ACCESS 2.0 Currently, a composite proficiency level of 5.0 with reading and writing proficiency levels of 4.2 in each. ISBE is meeting with stakeholders to revise the	P-8: 5% 9-12: 5%	<p>Description: The Illinois Administrative Code⁶⁹ identifies the state's English Language Development Standards as those developed by the WIDA Consortium⁷⁰ and the state's English Language Proficiency Assessment as the ACCESS for ELLs⁷¹.</p> <p>Research: The adherence of ACCESS for ELLs to the English Language Development Standards is documented by Cook (2007).⁷¹ The technical properties of the ACCESS for ELLs, including its validity, reliability, and operational performance, are published in annually updated reports by WIDA.⁷²</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools: This is a required indicator. In order to ascertain how EL proficiency aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools, ACCESS data, along with other required academic indicators and state-selected school quality indicators, will be provided when baseline</p>

⁶⁹ To see the English Language Development please see 23 Illinois Administrative Code 228 [Subtitle A, 228.10, Definitions](#)

⁷⁰ WIDA Consortium. "Amplification of the English language development standards, kindergarten-grade 12." Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, Madison, WI Google Scholar (2012).

⁷¹ Cook, H. Gary. "Alignment Study Report: The WIDA Consortium's English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12 to ACCESS for ELLs® Assessment." Madison, WI: WIDA Consortium (2007).

⁷² Center for Applied Linguistics (2016). "Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 303, 2014–2015 Administration." *WIDA Consortium Annual Technical Report No. 11* (2016).

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
	<p>definition of English language proficiency by June 30, 2017.</p> <p>ISBE will use a growth to target treatment for reporting purposes.</p>		<p>data is available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.⁷³</p>

⁷³ Stakeholder will provide a recommendation to ISBE on or before June 30, 2017.

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
v. Science	Administered at the conclusion of grades 3, 5, and once in high school (typically after a student completes Biology I).	0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)	<p>Description: The measure of academic achievement for science is the Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) along with the DLM-AA – Science Assessment for students with profound cognitive disabilities. The assessment is administered in an online format and is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards for Science incorporating the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)⁷⁴, which were adopted in 2014.</p> <p>Research: Science literacy is a necessary component to success and a key driver of the “nation’s capacity to innovate for economic growth and the ability of American workers to thrive in the global economy.”⁷⁵ Science is also a recognized indicator of college and career readiness.⁷⁶</p> <p>Technical reports for the 2016 and 2017 administrations will be provided to document validity, reliability, and comparability of the ISA. The DLM Consortium is currently writing the 2016 technical manual for DLM-Science.</p>

⁷⁴ NGSS Lead States. *Next generation science standards: For states, by states*. National Academies Press, 2013.

⁷⁵ Commission on Mathematics and Science Education (US). *Opportunity Equation: Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy*. Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2009.

⁷⁶ Mattern, Krista, Jeremy Burrus, Wayne Camara, Ryan O'Connor, Mary Ann Hansen, James Gambrell, Alex Casillas, and Becky Bobek. "Broadening the Definition of College and Career Readiness: A Holistic Approach. ACT Research Report Series, 2014 (5)." *ACT, Inc.* (2014). Dounay, Jennifer. "Embedding College Readiness Indicators in High School Curriculum and Assessments. Policy Brief." *Education Commission of the States (NJ1)* (2006).

Academic Indicators	Measure(s)	Weight of Academic Indicators: 75%	Description
			<p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:</p> <p>The Illinois Science Assessment is still under development, scoring, and standard setting. Evidence that this indicator contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state under the new accountability system will be provided when sufficient baseline data is available and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.</p>

School Quality/Student Success Indicators ⁷⁷	Weight	Description
i. Chronic Absenteeism (K-12)	P-8: 10% 9-12: 7.5%	<p>Description: IBAMC unanimously recommended including chronic absenteeism to be included as a student success indicator. The proposed definition is taken from “Attendance Matters.” It was recommended that chronic absenteeism be defined as <i>10% or more of excused and unexcused absences in the prior academic year</i>. IBAMC did caution that this definition excludes medically certified home/hospital instruction and absences pertaining to the death of a family member.</p> <p>Research: Illinois currently collects attendance.⁷⁸ This data is stable and collected consistently across all LEAs serving high school grades, as can be seen in the School Report Card: 15-Year Statewide Trend Data⁷⁹.</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:</p> <p>In order to ascertain how chronic absenteeism aids in the meaningful differentiation of</p>

⁷⁷ IBAMC also recommended that the Quality Framework: Assessment Tool for Support and Continuous Improvement developed by the committee be considered. Due to the requirements for school quality/school success indicators in ESSA, ISBE is committed to utilizing the quality framework within IL-EMPOWER. Additionally, IBAMC also recommended that ISBE consider additional indicators to be reported upon but outside of the accountability system. There was also interest in considering an indicator focusing upon access to a broader curriculum (arts, world languages, science, social sciences, vocational education, physical education, and enrichment and advanced learning opportunities). This indicator was not included in the current due to the lack of a specific definition.

⁷⁸ U.S. Department of Education. “Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation’s Schools. An Unprecedented Look at an Educational Crisis.” (2016):

<https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/chronicabsenteeism.html>.

⁷⁹ Center, Utah Education Policy. “Research brief: Chronic absenteeism.” Research Brief, University of Utah, College of Education (2012).

		schools, this data, along with other required academic indicators and state-selected school quality indicators, will be provided when baseline data is available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.
ii. 9th On-Track (HS)	9-12: 6.25%	<p>Description: The on-track indicator identifies students as on-track if they earn at least five full-year course credits and no more than one semester F in a core course in their first year of high school.</p> <p>Research: Research on the on-track indicator suggests that students are more than three and one-half times more likely to graduate from high school in four years than off-track students⁸⁰. The indicator is valuable because it is a more accurate predictor of graduation than students' previous achievement test scores or their background characteristics. Research has been conducted on its validity and predictive quality.⁸¹</p> <p>Support for on-track as a metric came from many stakeholders outside of Chicago Public Schools (CPS); however, evidence that the indicator aids in meaningful differentiation of schools can be seen in its inclusion in the district's own School Quality Rating system⁸².</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools: In order to ascertain how chronic absenteeism aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools, this data, along with other required academic indicators and state-selected</p>

⁸⁰ Additional information on 9th grade on-track may be accessed at: <http://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/p78.pdf>

⁸¹ Research on validity of the 9th grade on-track may be accessed at: https://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/REL_2012134.pdf

⁸² Data from CPS may be accessed at: <http://cps.edu/Performance/Documents/SQRPHandbook.pdf>

		school quality indicators, will be provided when baseline data is available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.
iii. College Career Ready Indicator (HS) ⁸³	9-12: 6.25%	<p>Description: Multiple states are developing a college and career ready indicator. This indicator identifies those areas of college and career readiness which research has suggested are important to postsecondary success.</p> <p>Research: This work is drawn from a research base⁸⁴ that suggests a number of indicators of readiness that can support the assertion that a child is ready academically and capable of entering the workforce.</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:</p> <p>Evidence that this indicator is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state and contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state will be provided when sufficient baseline data is available on all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.</p> <p><u>Distinguished Scholar</u></p>

⁸³ ISBE is grateful for the assistance for numerous stakeholders and the Governor's Office in the development of the college and career indicator and ensuring the representatives from P-12, higher education, and the business sector were included in its development. ISBE will continue to partner with stakeholders and other state agencies in the ensuing months to further define the career ready indicators for the purposes of data collection. Recommendations will be provided to ISBE no later than December 31, 2017. ISBE will share the ongoing work for public comment.

⁸⁴ Research by Redefining Ready can be accessed at: <https://www.redefiningready.org/research-college-ready/> and research by Advance CTE can be accessed at: <https://www.careertech.org/resources/data-and-accountability>.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• GPA: 3.75/4.0• ACT: 30 or SAT: 1400⁸⁵• At least one academic indicator in each ELA and Math• Three career ready indicators during the Junior/Senior Year [Algebra II can be in any year, if they earn an A, B, or C]• 95% Attendance junior and senior year <p><u>College and Career Ready</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. GPA: 2.8/4.02. 95% Attendance in high school junior and senior year3. College and Career Pathway Endorsement under Postsecondary Workforce Readiness Act (link to description here) <p>OR</p> <p>All of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">A. One Academic Indicator in each of ELA and Math during the Junior/Senior Year (or Algebra II at any time)B. Identify a Career Area of Interest by the end of the Sophomore YearC. Three Career Ready Indicators during the Junior/Senior Year <p>Academic Indicators</p> <table><tr><th>ELA</th><th>Math</th></tr><tr><td>ELA AP Exam (3+)</td><td>Math AP Exam (3+)</td></tr></table>	ELA	Math	ELA AP Exam (3+)	Math AP Exam (3+)
ELA	Math				
ELA AP Exam (3+)	Math AP Exam (3+)				

⁸⁵ This benchmark number will continue to be monitored based on ongoing conversations between ISBE and the College Board around level setting/cut scores.

		ELA Advanced Placement Course (A, B, or C)	Math Advanced Placement Course (A, B, or C)
		Dual Credit English Course (A, B, or C)	Dual Credit Math Course (A, B, or C)
		IB ELA course (A, B, or C)	IB Math course (A, B, or C)
		IB Exam 4+	IB Exam 4+
		College Remedial English (A, B, or C)	College Remedial Math (A, B, or C)
			Algebra II (A, B, or C)
		Minimum ACT Subject Scores of English 18, Reading 22	Minimum ACT Subject Score of Math 22, + Math in Senior Year
		Minimum SAT Subject Score of Evidence-Based Reading and Writing: 480	Minimum SAT Subject Score of Math: 530, + Math in Senior Year
Career Ready Indicators [Minimum of 3]			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplace Learning Experience • Industry Credential • Military Service (Including ROTC) • Dual Credit Career Pathway Course (A or B grade) • Completion of a Program of Study • Attaining and maintaining consistent employment for a minimum of 12 months • Consecutive summer employment • 25 hours of community service • Two or more organized co-curricular activities
iv. Climate Survey (5Essentials)	P-8: 5% 9-12: 5%	<p>Description: Description: In order to capture student (6-12), parent, teacher, and administration voice, ISBE will utilize the 5 Essentials Survey.⁸⁶</p> <p>Research: There is evidence, however, that school culture and climate has an impact on student achievement.⁸⁷ Illinois currently requires districts to use the 5Essentials</p>

⁸⁶ Further, IBAMC unanimously supported the development of a suite of surveys that meet both statutory and regulatory requirements to collect required data. Also, The Early Learning Council recommends, and ISBE agrees, that the use of climate survey in the early grades warrants further consideration of how information gleaned from a climate survey is most appropriately used within the boundaries of ESSA.

		<p>Survey or an alternate survey selected from a list approved by the State Superintendent. At this time, the 5Essentials Survey does not meet the technical criteria for inclusion as an indicator, as it cannot be disaggregated by student demographic group and is not required annually.⁸⁸ Initially, participation rate on the 5Essentials will be used for the purposes of accountability.</p> <p>Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:</p> <p>Support for climate and culture as a metric came from many stakeholders and was not exclusive to the 5Essentials Survey. However, evidence that a culture and climate indicator can aid in meaningful differentiation of schools can be seen in its inclusion in the CPS School Quality Rating system⁸⁹. Evidence that this indicator contributes to the meaningful differentiation of schools across the state will be provided when sufficient baseline data is available for all indicators and statistical analyses can be run and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Council.</p>
v. Fine Arts Indicator	<p>P-8: 0%</p> <p>9-12: 0%</p>	<p>ISBE recognizes the importance of the arts. Initially this importance is demonstrated by adding a fine arts indicator in the accountability system and weighting it at 0%. The indicator will include participation of students in fine arts courses as identified in the Student Information System (SIS). The determination of weight was based upon two things. First stakeholders desire an accountability system that is educative, equitable,</p>

⁸⁷ Bryk, Anthony S., Penny Bender Sebring, Elaine Allensworth, John Q. Easton, and Stuart Luppescu. Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 2010.

⁸⁸ ISBE is working on both the issue of meeting the requirements set forth in ESSA and amending School Code language to require annual administration of the 5Essentials Survey.

⁸⁹ Additional information of the CPS School Quality Rating System may be accessed at: <http://cps.edu/Performance/Documents/SQRPHandbook.pdf>

		and non-punitive. Weighting the fine arts indicator at this time could violate the third value for some schools and districts. ⁹⁰ For the next four-years, data for the fine arts will serve as the foundation for exploring how a more nuanced indicator can be developed for inclusion in future iterations of the accountability system. ⁹¹ Beginning in the 2018-2019 school year, ISBE will invite a stakeholder group to begin considering available data and the development of a more nuanced indicator with appropriate weighting for inclusion within the accountability system in 2021-2022. As the work develops over the next three years, ISBE will post for public comment.
--	--	--

⁹⁰ The fine arts indicator is receiving a weight of zero insofar as the regressive funding formula currently used to determine funding for Illinois schools means that for some districts, even though there is will to provide fine arts offerings, the district lacks the means to do so. In this way, the lack of offerings would negatively impact the summative designation for a school and for a reason far outside its control. Data from SIS suggests that 42 high schools in Illinois either lack fine arts offerings altogether or there are no students enrolled in fine arts courses.

⁹¹ On the surface, there are four different considerations in contemplating a fine arts indicator that will provide meaningful information to schools, parents, and caregivers: courses available, courses offered, student participation in coursework, and quality of the coursework. It appears that all four of these elements could be part of an indicator.

vi. [P-2]	P-8 5%	As identified by stakeholders, ESSA, because of its accountability requirements, appears to focus on students in grades 3 through 12. ISBE agrees with stakeholders that early learning is critical to long-term success and including an indicator as part of the accountability system will ensure recognition of its importance. Upon submission of the ESSA State plan for Illinois, ISBE will invite stakeholders to participate in a workgroup to investigate the development or identification of a P2 indicator for inclusion in the accountability system. This workgroup will commence in spring 2017, share drafts of their ongoing work for public comment with ISBE, and submit its recommendation to ISBE no later than December 31, 2017.
vii. [Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator]	P-8 5%	Stakeholders expressed interest in the development of a school quality/student success indicator for the elementary and middle grades. In theory, this indicator will be modeled after the idea of a college and career readiness indicator for high school. More specifically, the college and career indicator looks at a variety of curricular, extracurricular, work, and military experiences. The initial thinking behind an elementary and middle grade Indicator would be similar insofar as it would identify a range of experiences that children undergo during their schooling and that contribute to school success in later grades (e.g., opportunities for acceleration, participation in extracurricular activities). ⁹² Upon submission of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, ISBE will invite stakeholders to participate in a workgroup to investigate the development or identification of an Elementary/Middle Grade level indicator for inclusion in the

⁹² In previous drafts, the elementary/middle level indicator was identified as “8th grade on-track.” Feedback for the Office of the Governor suggested that this indicator should be more robust than only 8th grade on-track. This idea supports the belief of some stakeholders who stated that, just as there is a college and career metaindicator in the 9-12 accountability system that considers those experiences that suggest success in postsecondary education and the workforce, there should be metaindicator that collects data on those experiences that support a child in becoming prepared for the rigors of high school in the P-8 accountability system.

		accountability system. This workgroup will commence in the spring 2017, share drafts of their ongoing work for public comment with ISBE, and submit its recommendation to ISBE no later than December 31, 2017.
--	--	---

DRAFT

Accountability as a transition toward the identification of schools for support and a single summative designation

The accountability system provides information for schools and communities on academic achievement for all students, student growth, EL growth (to proficiency), and multiple school quality/student success indicators. In ESSA, two other purposes of the system are to identify schools that may require support as well as provide a single summative designation for each school. Each will be described in turn, although they are interdependent.

Identification of Schools for Support

ISBE has been clear from the outset of the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois that all students must achieve at the highest levels possible. If this is true, it is incumbent upon ISBE and LEAs to provide support to buttress the academic achievement of those groups of students that are struggling.

The determinations resulting from the accountability system should both highlight areas in which one or more subgroups may be excelling, as well as identify equity gaps between those groups that are excelling and those that are not. Again, if the latter is the case, schools must receive assistance to provide the supports and resources necessary to help each and every child be academically successful. Put differently, the accountability system in ESSA serves as the means through which schools are both identified for support *and* the creation of a summative designation in order to meaningfully differentiate schools.

There are two categories of schools in ESSA – comprehensive schools and targeted schools. Schools that are in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide or a high school that has a graduation rate below 67 percent are identified in the former category. Schools in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools are identified as targeted schools.⁹³ Both of these schools are required to receive support in order to improve student performance. Schools identified for comprehensive supports must use IL-EMPOWER and have a work plan with targets and timelines approved ISBE. Schools identified for targeted support must develop a plan that is approved by its district and *may* access supports through IL-EMPOWER.⁹⁴ This support is delivered through IL-EMPOWER.

Meaningful Differentiation of Schools

The comprehensive school and targeted school designations matter for the purpose of identifying schools for the appropriate services. ISBE will use a system with four tiers to meaningfully differentiate schools. Put differently:

Tier 1: Exemplary School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

⁹³ Those schools that receive targeted services but that are unable to increase academic achievement/growth within a four year period of time would then be identified as a chronically underperforming subgroup and required to receive comprehensive services.

⁹⁴ IL-EMPOWER is available to all schools in Illinois. Those schools that wish to use IL-Empower services are required to complete a needs assessment/equity audit in order to identify areas in need of support as well as develop an improvement plan with targets and a timeline.

Tier 2: Commendable School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups and a graduation rate above 67 percent but whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Tier 3: Underperforming School: A school in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools. Schools in Tier Three: Underperforming shall receive targeted services.⁹⁵

Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School: A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I schools in Illinois and those high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 67 percent. School in Tier 4: Lowest-Performing shall receive comprehensive services.⁹⁶

ESSA also requires that ISBE provide this information in an easily accessible and understandable way to parents, caregivers, and community members through the Illinois State Report Card. Thus, in addition to identifying schools for services and meaningfully differentiating schools from one another through a summative designation, ISBE must also provide additional representations of the data for the purposes of identifying subgroup performance within a school and, if applicable, showing equity gaps.

Data Visualization

A challenge when taking the data from the accountability system and creating a single summative designation is to do so in a way that is intuitive to the viewer yet meaningfully demonstrates the complexity of the work that occurs in schools each day. ISBE is beginning to work on a system that will provide the viewer an “all students” view, individual subgroup summative designations used in determining the “all students view,” and the individual accountability indicators for each subgroup. ISBE shall do this by color-coding each tier of performance for each indicator and each subgroup.

Consider the following example, which begins with the representation of the data at its most expansive -- the school single summative designation (all students view). This will be followed by the aggregate subgroup scores that are used to determine the single summative designation, and finally, the individual accountability scores for a subgroup that makes up the aggregate subgroup score. When a parent, caregiver, or community member accesses the Illinois Report Card to view school performance, the dashboard they initially interact with will provide the “all students” view for a school. The viewer will be able to see this information at the subgroup level and grade level within different pages of the Report Card in order to see equity gaps, should they exist within the school.

The majority of the indicators included in the accountability system have student-level data (e.g.,

⁹⁵ Schools receiving a Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School designation will receive comprehensive services. As part of this work, the school must develop an improvement plan approved by ISBE.

⁹⁶ Schools receiving a Tier 3: Underperforming School designation will receive targeted services. As part of this work, the school must develop an improvement plan approved by the district.

achievement data, growth data, EL proficiency). In order to create a single summative score, each indicator will be standardized to a common 100 point scale to resolve these differences and create a system that is consistent, comparable, and simple for all stakeholders to understand. ISBE will partner with National Center for Improvement in Educational Assessment in support of the TAC when developing this index. We are fortunate in Illinois to have individuals with statistical expertise as strong partners in our process. Work will begin in April of 2017.

ALL STUDENTS VIEW

First, using the results from the accountability system for each subgroup at the school, each school will be provided a single, final summative designation.

Tier 1: Exemplary School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Tier 2: Commendable School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups and a graduation rate above 67 percent, and whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Tier 3: Underperforming School: A school in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools.

Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School: A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I schools in Illinois and those high schools that have a graduation rate of 67 percent.

ISBE Elementary School	Designation: Tier 1: Exemplary School
All Students	

For example, ISBE Elementary School has received a school designation of Tier 1: **Exemplary School**.

AGGREGATE SUBGROUP VIEW

Second, in order to receive the designation of **Tier 1: Exemplary School**, all subgroups must have either received a designation of **Tier 2: Commendable School** or **Tier 1: Exemplary School**. In the example below, one can see that of the subgroups that met the reporting size requirement,⁹⁷ all of the reportable subgroups have either a **Tier 1: Exemplary School** designation or **Tier 2: Commendable School** designation

⁹⁷ Please note that for this example, blank cells mean that either there were no enrolled students in the subgroup or the n size was fewer than 10.

by grade level.

ISBE Elementary School	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Overall Grade Level Aggregated Designation
Economically Disadvantaged Students				
Children with Disabilities				
English Learners				
Former English Learners				
Students formerly with a Disability				
Hispanic or Latino				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Black or African American				
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander				
White				
Two or More Races				
Student who is a parent in the armed forces				
Children in Foster Care				
Homeless Children/Youths				

SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE ON INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

In order to calculate an individual subgroup score, the scores for each indicator will have been aggregated.⁹⁸

For the purposes of this example, only the English Learners at grades 3 through 5 will be used.

⁹⁸ There is a process through which the different results and weights can be standardized for all collected indicators. In the case of the indicators in the Illinois accountability system, the majority of the indicators included in the accountability system have student-level data (e.g., achievement data, growth data, EL proficiency). In order to create a single summative score each indicator will be standardized to a common 100 point scale to resolve these differences and create a system that is consistent, comparable, and simple for all stakeholders to understand. ISBE will partner with National Center for Improvement in Educational Assessment in support of TAC developing this index. Work will begin in April of 2017.

	Grade Three	Grade Four	Grade Five
English Learners			
ELA Proficiency			
Math Proficiency			
Growth			
EL Proficiency			
Chronic Absenteeism			
Climate Survey			
Fine Arts			
Grade Level Rating			

The calculation of an “all students” or whole school score occurs when:

1. The Whole School designation is calculated by looking at every subgroup’s success within each grade level and for all available indicators. That score is out of 100 on a point index.
2. Each subgroup in each grade level and for all available indicators is provided an index score for each indicator. The aggregate of these index scores is the Grade Level designation.
3. If the Grade Level designation reveals one or more underperforming subgroups, the final designation will be Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School or Tier 3: Underperforming School (Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School if the Whole School designation is in the bottom 5% overall, Tier 3: Underperforming School, otherwise). If the Grade Level designation reveals zero underperforming subgroups, the final status will be Tier 2: Commendable School or Tier 1: Exemplary School (Tier 1: Exemplary School if the Whole School designation is in the top 10% overall, Tier 2: Commendable School, otherwise).

Tier 3: Underperforming School and Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School:

The following example emphasizes the fact that no matter how well most subgroups may perform at a school, if a school has one or more underperforming subgroups, the school cannot receive a designation higher than **Tier 3: Underperforming School**.

ALL STUDENTS VIEW

EBSI Elementary School	Designation: Tier 3: Underperforming School
All Students	

AGGREGATE SUBGROUP VIEW

EBSI Elementary School	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Overall Grade Level Aggregated Designation
Economically Disadvantaged Students				
Children with Disabilities				
English Learners				
Former English Learners				
Students formerly with a Disability				
Hispanic or Latino				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Black or African American				
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander				
White				
Two or More Races				
Student who is a parent in the armed forces				
Children in Foster Care				
Homeless Children/Youths				

SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE ON INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

	Grade Three	Grade Four	Grade Five
White			
ELA Proficiency			
Math Proficiency			
Growth			
EL Proficiency			
Chronic Absenteeism			
Climate Survey			
Fine Arts			
Grade Level Rating			

B. Subgroups.

1. List the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group in the state, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2), and, as applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students used in the accountability system.
 - Economically disadvantaged students.
 - Children with disabilities.
 - English Learners
 - Former English Learners
 - Students formerly with a disability
 - Students from each major racial and ethnic group.
 - Hispanic or Latino
 - American Indian or Alaska Native
 - Asian
 - Black or African American
 - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - White
 - Two or More Races
2. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on state assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b), including the number of years the state includes the results of former children with disabilities.

Students formerly with disabilities will not be included in the subgroup of children with disabilities for the purposes of accountability, as they are now being treated as their own subgroup. The definitions for students with disabilities and students formerly with disabilities are as follows:

1. **Students with disabilities** includes students who were identified as having a disability through formal evaluations and met specific criteria as stated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to be eligible for special education and related services by a team of individuals who developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Students with a 504 Plan are also identified as students with a disability who have met specific criteria as stated under the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and are eligible to receive accommodations and related services in a general education setting. Both of these groups -- students with disabilities and students with a 504 Plan -- can include English Learners with a disability or English Learners with a 504 Plan. These students would be eligible for services that are inclusive of language assistance and disability-related services.

2. **Students formerly with disabilities** includes students who were previously identified as a student with a disability who had an active IEP in the past four years, but does not currently have an active IEP due to not meeting eligibility requirements; has since graduated; and/or has aged out of receiving services. It also includes students who were previously identified as a student with a disability who had an active 504, but does not currently have an active 504. ISBE will continue to report data on students formerly with disabilities through grade 12.
- C. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former English Learners in the English Learner subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on state assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1), including the number of years the state includes the results of former English Learners.

Former English Learners will not be included in the subgroup of English Learners for the purposes of accountability, as they are now being treated as their own subgroup. The definitions for English Learners and former English Learners are as follows:

1. **English Learners** include students who are determined to be limited in English proficiency.
 2. **Former English Learners** include English Learners who met the state reclassification criteria on ACCESS through high school graduation. ISBE is currently meeting with stakeholders to revise this definition to conform with WIDA's guidance on proficiency cut scores and input from practitioners in the field. ISBE will continue to report data on former English Learners through grade 12.
- D. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English Learners in the state:
- ☐ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(i) or
 - ☒ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(ii) or
 - ☐ Exception under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(4)(i)(B). If selected, provide a description of the uniform procedure in the box below.
- [Click here to enter text.](#)

E. Minimum Number of Students.

1. Provide the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability that the state determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a).

In previous drafts of the plan, ISBE had proposed that all subgroups should have a minimum size, referred to as n-size, of 20. EL subgroups, both the traditional subgroups and a newly created "former EL subgroup," would also have an n-size of 20.

The IBAMC reached majority consensus to recommend an n-size for subgroups of 30. The rationale for the committee's recommendation stemmed from the fact that the current

subgroup n-size used by ISBE for accountability purposes is 30. Members came to consensus that lowering the existing n-size may result in too much weight on small subsets of students, as well as cause unintended statistical consequences.

The Illinois Education Association (IEA) recommended n-size of 25, believing it was an appropriate compromise between educational stakeholders that supported 30 and those, such as the Illinois Latino Policy Forum, which supported 20.

2. If the state's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability, provide that number consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(iv).

The minimum number of students for reporting purposes will continue to be 10.

3. Describe how the state's minimum number of students meets the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)-(2);

Illinois is following the process recommended in Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information⁹⁹, a congressionally mandated report compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics. Illinois convened multiple teams¹⁰⁰ "with sufficient statistical and data expertise to lead the effort to establish a minimum n-size." Next, as sufficient baseline data is available for all indicators, Illinois with the assistance of TAC will begin to verify that the resulting estimates will be statistically valid and reliable.

4. Describe how other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the state's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each subgroup of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2);

The state's uniform procedure for averaging data is to combine individual student-level data for each indicator across three school years to create a composite score that can then

⁹⁹ Seastrom, Marilyn. Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information. (IES 2017-147). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, DC., 2017. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

¹⁰⁰ The Illinois Balanced Assessment Measures Committee, the P-20 Council Data, Assessment and Accountability Sub-committee, and the ISBE Accountability Working Group Technical Sub-committee.

be divided by the actual number of students represented in the indicator pool to determine an average score for the school and the relevant student demographic groups.

A secondary analysis is run such that the reported score, for the purposes of accountability and identification, is the composite average of three years of data or the individual year composite score, whichever is higher, provided that selecting the higher score for student demographic groups does not result in a non-reportable score. This is done to ensure that schools that have been identified as needing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement and that are making improvements are not negatively affected by past performance. This procedure functionally triples the sample size available for making calculations for the purposes of accountability, which increases statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data¹⁰¹ while further protecting the identity of individual student data¹⁰².

5. Describe the strategies the state uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;

The strategy that Illinois utilizes to protect the privacy of individual students is to suppress data for demographic groups that are below a minimum size of 10, pursuant to both the Family Educational Right to Privacy Act (FERPA), as well as the Illinois School Student Records Act (ISSRA), 5 ILCS 140/7 (1) (a).¹⁰³ FERPA and ISSRA require that personally identifiable information be protected from disclosure, but do not provide exact parameters for some situations. Therefore, industry best practices have evolved in response, and ED, through the Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC), has taken the lead on identifying and encouraging some of these best practices. PTAC suggests use of cell size suppression as an appropriate method of privacy protection. ISBE applies a minimum cell size of 10 as its minimum group size reporting rule in cases where other information, such as student

¹⁰¹ American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational, and Psychological Testing (US). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Amer Educational Research Assn, 1999.

¹⁰² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting (NCES 2011-603), <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>.

¹⁰³ From the Illinois School Student Records Act: "Personal information contained within public records, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, unless the disclosure is consented to in writing by the individual subjects of the information. 'Unwarranted invasion of personal privacy' means the disclosure of information that is highly personal or objectionable to a reasonable person and in which the subject's right to privacy outweighs any legitimate public interest in obtaining the information."

outcomes or scores, could be combined with small subgroup data to deduce the identity of particular students. ISBE is among a majority of states using 10 as its minimum group size.¹⁰⁴

6. Provide information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in 4.B.i above for whose results schools would not be held accountable under the state's system for annual meaningful differentiation of schools required by 34 C.F.R. § 200.18;

Data on the number and percentage of all students and students in each student demographic group included in the accountability system that would fall under the n-size determined by the State Board will be provided after three years of baseline data is available to be used in accountability calculations.

7. If an SEA proposes a minimum number of students that exceeds 30, provide a justification that explains how a minimum number of students provided in 4.C above promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations, including data on the number and percentage of schools in the state that would not be held accountable in the system of annual meaningful differentiation under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 for the results of students in each subgroup in 4.B.i above using the minimum number proposed by the state compared to the data on the number and percentage of schools in the state that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup if the minimum number of students is 30.

Not applicable

F. Annual Meaningful Differentiation. Describe the state's system for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the state, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

Describe the following information with respect to the state's system of annual meaningful differentiation:

1. The distinct and discrete levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;

¹⁰⁴ The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics notes: "Individual states have adopted minimum group size reporting rules, with the minimum number of students ranging from 5 to 30 and a modal category of 10 (used by 39 states in the most recent results available on state websites in late winter of 2010). Each state has adopted additional practices to protect personally identifiable information about its students in reported results. These practices include various forms of suppression, top and bottom coding of values at the ends of a distribution, and limiting the amount of detail reported for the underlying counts." (NCES 2011-603, available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>)

The majority of the indicators included in the accountability system have student-level data, with the exception of the school culture and climate indicator. A majority of the indicators have different scales and measures. These multiple scales and measures cannot be easily compared and are not always meaningful in a school-level accountability system. Each indicator will be standardized to a common 100 point scale to resolve these differences and create a system that is consistent, comparable, and simple for all stakeholders to understand¹⁰⁵.

Performance levels will be described in relative terms of the progress schools are making toward the identified interim and long-term goals for the individual indicators. The first performance level for each indicator would be schools that meet or exceed the long-term goal and would be worth the full 100 points. The lowest performance level would be schools experiencing a decline in performance and would be worth no points. However, to establish meaningful performance levels that capture progress, within reasonable limits, toward interim and long-term goals would be established for each indicator. This performance level setting would follow a process founded on the principles of transparency, stakeholder engagement, and external validation¹⁰⁶. The nuance of these performance levels and their reasonable limits are particularly important to reflect known evidence on school improvement¹⁰⁷ and to avoid the regressive qualities (e.g., Pass/Fail) of Annual Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind. The specific number of performance levels and their relative performance descriptors would be determined through a systemic standard-setting process that draws upon the professional and technical expertise of practitioners and is informed by analyses of past performance distribution¹⁰⁸.

Applying a uniform number of performance levels to each indicator would fail to meaningfully differentiate school performance. Indicators with greater differences in performance (e.g., wider distributions and larger standard deviations) will need more performance levels. Indicators with narrow distributions of performance will need fewer

¹⁰⁵ Reyna, Ryan, *Key Issues in Aggregating Indicators for Accountability Determinations under ESSA*, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C., 2016. Accessed March 1, 2017 at <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/KeyIssuesinAggregatingIndicators.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ Blank, Rolf K. "Developing a system of education indicators: Selecting, implementing, and reporting indicators." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15, no. 1 (1993): 65-80.

¹⁰⁷ Evidence from the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) program in Illinois indicates schools experience spurts of rapid improvement that are then sustained or even regress slightly, which then become the foundation for additional periods of more noticeable improvement. Improvement does not occur in constant, equal intervals.

¹⁰⁸ American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association, 2014.

levels in order to have validity to stakeholders. For example, student achievement has a wide distribution ranging from 98 percent to 2 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards and would require a greater number of levels to meaningfully capture progress of schools across the spectrum. Stakeholders understand there are meaningful differences between the experience of students in schools where 85 percent of students meet or exceed standards and those that have only 35 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards. The four-year graduation rate has a much narrower distribution, and applying an equal number of performance levels could result in a school with an 86 percent graduation rate and a school with an 88 percent graduation rate in different performance levels. When levels are too narrow, they hold less validity and meaning for stakeholders. Performance level setting is a socially constructed process of informed meaning-making, but the results of the performance level setting can be externally informed and validated by comparing the determinations against research, past performance data, and ongoing stakeholder engagement.

In the past, Illinois has used a Technical Advisory Council to set local performance levels. It will reconvene this group again, beginning in 2017, to reconcile the existing student performance levels of each indicator, such that they can coherently be combined into a single accountability system, as well as to inform the development and integration of additional indicators as new instruments are developed and validated. Illinois will also work collaboratively with the staff of the National Center for Improvement in Educational Assessment in order to identify performance levels and the system as a whole.

Summary of Performance Levels

Performance Level Descriptor	Points
School Meets or Exceeds Long-Term Goal	100
An appropriate range of on-track to interim goal performance levels... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School is on track to meet interim goal or within -X% School is on track to meet interim goal or within -Y% School is on track to meet interim goal or within -Z%... 	Scale distributed proportionately to number of levels
School Performance Declines	0

- The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b) and (c)(1)-(2).

After deep engagement with stakeholders¹⁰⁹, ISBE is proposing a weighting of 75 percent for academic indicators and 25 percent school quality and student success indicators. Public comment has largely supported growth as the predominant measure. IBAMC members had varied opinions as to the specific weights of the academic indicators, but generally it was suggested that growth be weighted more than proficiency and that the EL proficiency indicator should be weighted less than either the proficiency or growth metric.

Within the accountability system, the following weights will be assigned:

Category ¹¹⁰	Elementary	High School
Core Academic Indicators = 75%	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)
	Math Proficiency – 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	Math Proficiency 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)
	Science Proficiency – 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)	Science Proficiency – 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)
	ELA and Math Growth -50% (simple linear regression)	Graduation/ELA and Math Growth - 50% ¹¹¹
	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to proficiency treatment)	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to proficiency treatment)

¹⁰⁹ IBAMC recommended 51%/49%, the Governor's Office supported 80%/20%. The IASB, IASA, IPA, and IARSS support the notion that student growth should be weighted more than proficiency, with English proficiency receiving the least weight. CPS indicated that student growth should be weighted twice that of proficiency and no more than 5-10% to English proficiency.

¹¹⁰ As suggested by stakeholders and recommended by the Governor, ISBE will use a five-year timeline for EL proficiency. This timeline will begin no earlier than first grade (students can receive services in P and K settings), and proficiency will be calculated using a growth to target metric. Also, ISBE will follow report on former ELs through grade 12.

¹¹¹ Until a means of measuring growth is established in grades 9-12, ISBE recommends comparing 9th grade on-track by cohort to graduation rate. Schools that have 90% or greater of 9th-grade students on-track and, in four years, graduate 90% or more of those students will receive the highest designation. Schools in which the graduation rate is below 67% will be eligible for comprehensive services and receive the designation indicating this eligibility regardless of the percentage of the 9th-grade cohort on-track.

School Quality Indicators = 25% ¹¹²	Chronic Absenteeism – 10%	Chronic Absenteeism – 7.5%
	Climate Surveys – 5%	Climate Surveys -5%
	Fine Arts Indicator – 0%	Fine Arts Indicator – 0%
	[Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator] – 5%	9 th Grade On-Track -6.25%
	[P-2 Indicator] – 5% ¹¹³	College and Career Readiness -6.25%

IBAMC members raised the idea of incorporating “some type of student growth measure” at the high school level as part of the academic indicators. In this scenario, members were in favor of weighting growth equal to or as much as double that of proficiency.¹¹⁴

However, there was ample acknowledgement that the present assessment system at the high school level does not permit a growth measure at this time. The Governor, in his recommendations, acknowledged the importance of growth at the high school level and made a commitment to finding the resources so that this data can be collected in grades 9 through 12.

With the acknowledgement that the quality of the assessment and data systems is in the process of becoming more stable, ISBE will conduct additional modeling and simulation of accountability system data and ongoing engagement of stakeholders to ensure that a substantial body of evidence supports the validity and reliability of the system.

3. The summative determinations, including how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4).

Stakeholders provided a great deal of input regarding both the number and naming of the summative determinations. There was support for not creating a summative determination of any kind¹¹⁵, particularly for schools serving high-poverty communities. However, a summative

¹¹² Depending upon school configuration and until such a time when indicators identified parenthetically are available, the total weight of the school quality/school success indicator will be placed upon the available indicator(s) for the school configuration.

¹¹³ P20 recommended an early grades indicator be developed to serve as a school quality/student success indicator.

¹¹⁴ The IEA supports equal weight to be afforded to proficiency and student growth, with no more than 15% to English proficiency. IASB, IASA, IPA, and IARSS support the notion that student growth should be weighted more than proficiency, with English proficiency receiving the least weight. CPS indicated that student growth should be weighted twice that of proficiency and no more than 5-10% to English proficiency.

¹¹⁵ Many comments to this effect were submitted by Illinois Federation of Teachers members.

determination is required in the final regulations and potentially disadvantages those same high-poverty schools by restricting their identification to a single summative assessment, rather than the full range of indicators in the accountability system. Support for a four- or five-tier system was offered by the Management Alliance, Advance Illinois, Chicago Public Schools, and other stakeholder groups. There was similar support for a simple to understand, three-tier summative system¹¹⁶. In balancing the tension between simplicity and the need to reflect complex contextual factors, as well as the need to meaningfully differentiate schools, a system with four or more tiers addressed more of the expressed concerns and aspirations of the majority of stakeholders.

Illinois proposes a four-tiered system of summative designations of its schools:

Tier 1: Exemplary School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Tier 2: Commendable School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups and a graduation rate above 67 percent, and whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Tier 3: Underperforming School: A school in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools.

Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School: A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I schools in Illinois and those high schools that have a graduation rate of 67 percent.

4. It is Illinois’ belief that all schools have something to learn from and share with their colleagues in a supportive community of practice. Stakeholders have been very clear that the accountability system should be educative, equitable, and non-punitive. It makes sense that the meaningful differentiation of schools and summative designation exemplify these values, too. Thus, a summative determination should assist in both the required differentiation within the final ESSA rules as well as creating a connection between schools and districts throughout the state.¹¹⁷ How the system for meaningful differentiation and the methodology for identifying schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 will ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators are more likely to be identified for

¹¹⁶ Comments submitted by Stand for Children and Consortium for Educational Change.

¹¹⁷ Participation in IL-EMPOWER will be required for schools requiring comprehensive services, but all schools are eligible to be a part of IL-EMPOWER.

comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(3) and (d)(1)(ii).

Schools eligible for comprehensive supports and services shall include:

- (A) The lowest-performing 5 percent of all schools on the state accountability system receiving Title I funds,
- (B) **All** public high schools in the state failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, regardless of whether or not they receive Title I funds, and
- (C) Title I schools that have been notified that they have one or more student demographic groups that is performing on par with the “all students” group in schools in group (A) of school, and for whom, after three years of implementing targeted supports and improvement, the performance of those subgroups has not improved beyond that of group (A).

By default, LEAs with schools that would meet the definition for group (C) but who have not otherwise been identified, that is,

- (D) Schools that have one or more student demographic groups that are performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools must be identified and notified that they are eligible for targeted supports and services beginning in 2018-19.

If, after three years, the performance of these same subgroups remains on par with that of group (A), they would then be identified for comprehensive supports and services.

Additionally, other schools defined by the state as chronically underperforming are those schools that:

- (E) Fall within the bottom 10 percent of all schools on the state accountability system receiving Title I funds for three years in a row.
- (F) Fail to test at least 95 percent of their student population, including relevant student demographic groups, for three years in a row.

Data to demonstrate that Illinois’ system of accountability will ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators are more likely to be identified for comprehensive support will not be available until three years of baseline data is available for all indicators in the accountability system.

G. Participation Rate. Describe how the state is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools consistent with the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.15.

ISBE will incorporate the 95 percent rate into the proficiency academic indicator. If a school does not have 95 percent participation rate, it cannot score at the highest level of proficiency.

- H. Data Procedures.** Describe the state’s uniform procedure for averaging data, including combining data across school years, combining data across grades, or both, in a school as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable.

The state’s uniform procedure for averaging data is to combine individual student-level data for each indicator across three school years to create a composite score that can then be divided by the actual number of students represented in the indicator pool to determine an average score for the school and the relevant student demographic groups. A secondary analysis is run such that the reported score, for the purposes of accountability and identification, is the composite average of three years of data or the individual year composite score, whichever is higher, provided that selecting the higher score for student demographic groups does not result in a non-reportable score. This is done to ensure that schools that have been identified as needing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement and who are making improvements are not negatively affected by past performance. This procedure functionally triples the sample size available for making calculations for the purposes of accountability, which increases statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data¹¹⁸ while further protecting the identity of individual student data¹¹⁹.

- I. Including All Public Schools in a state’s Accountability System.** If the state uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in D above for any of the following specific types of schools, describe how they are included, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii):

1. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the state's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the state is not required to administer a standardized assessment to meet this requirement;

¹¹⁸ American Educational Research Association. Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: Author, 2014.

¹¹⁹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting (NCES 2011-603), <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>.

ISBE has historically used a technique called back mapping for schools in which no grade level is assessed under the state's academic assessment system. That is, the closest assessed grade in a school that the attending students feed into (e.g., grade 3 for K-2 building; grade 11 for grade 9 building) was identified and those results applied to the building. Alternately, district aggregate results can be used to provide proxy academic indicators in schools that potentially draw from multiple districts. Illinois has 122 configurations of schools. The many configurations of schools, such as those listed below and more, as well as transitions through new and different assessment structures (e.g., course-based versus grade level) has prompted ISBE to convene its Technical Advisory Council to review historical and contemporary practices and determine specific techniques for implementation in 2018-19.

- ii. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);

Schools with variant grade configurations will be reported for purposes of accountability at the highest complete grade band configuration. Thus, a P-12 school would be held accountable under the structure of the high school grade band accountability system. All grade level results for all indicators would be reported for these schools.

- iii. Small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator under 34 C.F.R. § 200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1), consistent with a state's uniform procedures for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable;

The state's uniform procedure for averaging data is to combine individual student-level data for each indicator across three school years to create a composite score that can then be divided by the actual number of students represented in the indicator pool to determine an average score for the school and the relevant student demographic groups. This procedure functionally triples the sample size available for making calculations for the purposes of accountability, which increases statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data¹²⁰ while further protecting the identity of individual student data¹²¹.

¹²⁰ American Educational Research Association. Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: Author, 2014.

¹²¹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting (NCES 2011-603), <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>.

- iv. Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings; students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities; students enrolled in state public schools for the deaf or blind; and recently arrived English Learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students); and

Schools, such as state public schools for the deaf or blind, are already well integrated into existing state reporting and data systems. Historically, many students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings fell outside the administration of the Illinois State Board of Education and these students were either represented within the system or not based on their specific placement at the time assessments were administered. ISBE is in ongoing dialogue with the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) to more fully integrate these students into the accountability system. As appropriate, this section of the application will be amended to reflect changes in practice.

- v. Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a state's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable, for at least one indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort for students).

All data for schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with Illinois uniform procedure for averaging data, will be publicly reported through the Illinois School Report Card, but will not be included for the purposes of accountability until such time as a stable baseline is available.

4.2 Identification of Schools.

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the state identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.

Schools eligible to receive comprehensive supports and services¹²² will be identified using the following methodology:

¹²² ISBE will work directly with those schools identified for comprehensive services to ensure that appropriate programming is aligned with Title IV funding.

1. First, the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, as determined by the state accountability system, will be identified. ISBE will concentrate greater resources to those schools.
2. Next, high schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 67 percent, including those high schools that are not Title I eligible, that have not already been identified as being within the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools will be identified.
3. Finally, schools with chronically low-performing student demographic groups that have implemented targeted support and improvement plans, where, for more than three years, those same demographic groups that resulted in identification remain in the bottom 5 percent of performance compared of the all students subgroup for comprehensive schools.

Schools in the first two categories will be first identified, using data from the full range of the accountability system, and notified that they are required to partner with an IL-EMPOWER Partner Provider(s) for comprehensive supports and services in developing and implementing comprehensive improvement plans in 2018-19.¹²³ Schools in the third category will be identified in 2021-22 after these schools have had a three-year opportunity to identify and implement appropriate supports and services. School identification and notification will occur on a three-year cycle, but schools that are identified in 2018-19 may take one planning year and up to three years of full implementation before needing to meet the statewide exit criteria.

- ii. The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the state, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).

The following exit criteria are proposed:

¹²³ Districts, especially those with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted services, will be provided access to professional learning opportunities that include organizational, leadership, and capacity-building strategies regarding reflective supervision; job-embedded professional development; learning communities; data literacy; resource allocation; instructional technology and data; information literacy; implementation of Universal Design for Learning; recruitment and retention of teachers in high-poverty and/or high-minority districts; parent family and community engagement; restorative practices; addressing issues related to school environment and school climate; and the development of school-community partnerships. Title I, School Improvement, Title II, IDEA, Title IV Part A and B, and State Longitudinal Data Systems dollars will be used for funding.

1. That a school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement.
2. That a school, in addition to no longer meeting the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement, has established a growth trajectory for students, including those at the highest and lowest levels of attainment.
3. That the school has a strong plan for sustainability of the progress that it has made that articulates a clear rationale for what it proposes to sustain, including a theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and a robust progress monitoring plan. This sustainability plan must explain how the school will maintain a strong rate of growth and change for P-12 students, as applicable depending upon school configuration¹²⁴ and including transitions from one school site to another while addressing how the school intends to ensure sustainability with reduced services, supports, and/or funding¹²⁵.

Schools will have one optional planning year and up to three years of full implementation of comprehensive support and improvement plans before being expected to meet these exit criteria. Schools that are identified in 2018-19 and that opt to take a planning year would need to meet these criteria by 2022-23. Schools that do not opt to take a planning year would be expected to meet these criteria by 2021-22.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

The state's methodology for identifying any school with a "consistently underperforming" subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the state to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).

Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups of students will be identified through the following methodology:

1. Any school that has failed to meet the 95 percent assessment threshold for all students or for one or more student demographic groups for the past three years in a row will be identified and notified of their eligibility.

¹²⁴ For instance, the Early Learning Council recommends that this plan include ways of ensuring Kindergarten readiness and how to sustain those gains through the early elementary years. Additional information on the sustainability plan required for exiting services will be shared with districts as ESSA begins implementation.

¹²⁵ Comments and suggestions made by the Consortium for Educational Change, based on its experience supporting school improvement in schools awarded School Improvement 1003(g) Grants, influenced the addition of criteria 2 and 3.

2. Any school for which the former English Learner subgroup's or the students formerly with disabilities subgroup's performance is on par with that of the "all students" group in any school will be identified for comprehensive supports and improvement.¹²⁶

Notification will begin in 2018-19 and will be conducted annually thereafter. Schools identified under this definition will have an LEA-determined number of years to implement targeted supports and improvement. Schools identified for targeted supports and services *may* utilize approved providers through IL-EMPOWER.¹²⁷

The state's methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

1. First, the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, as determined by the state accountability system (including all weighting of student demographic groups), will be identified.
2. Next, high schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 67 percent that have not already been identified as being within the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools will be identified.
3. Finally, schools that receive Title I funds that have student demographic groups whose performance is on par with the performance of the "all students" group of the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools will be notified they are eligible for targeted supports and services and should implement targeted improvement plans.

Identification and notification will begin in 2018-19 and will be conducted every three years following. School identification and notification will occur on a three-year cycle, but schools that are identified in 2018-19 may take one planning year and up to three years of

¹²⁶ Put differently, if students who have exited the English Learner and students with a disability subgroups and as members of the former English Learners and former students with a disability subgroups do not make gains or regress, the school will be identified for comprehensive services.

¹²⁷ Districts, especially those with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted services, will be provided access to professional learning opportunities that include organizational, leadership, and capacity-building strategies regarding reflective supervision; job-embedded professional development; learning communities; data literacy; resource allocation; instructional technology and data; information literacy; implementation of Universal Design for Learning; recruitment and retention of teachers in high-poverty and/or high-minority districts; parent family and community engagement; restorative practices; addressing issues related to school environment and school climate; and the development of school-community partnerships. Title I, School Improvement, Title II, IDEA, Title IV Part A and B, and State Longitudinal Data Systems dollars will be used for funding.

full implementation before needing to meet the statewide exit criteria. ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of quarterly reports the provide data on progress in achieving identified targets. Schools identified for targeted services that do not make the required gains will then be identified as comprehensive schools and will be required to use IL-EMPOWER services.

The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).

In response to the questions posed in the first draft, commenters offered suggestions for criteria for exiting status. ISBE concurs with several commenters that a strong plan for sustainability (such that, at a minimum, all students are on a trajectory to reach grade level and graduate college and career ready) is necessary to no longer require targeted support. Therefore, the following exit criteria are proposed:

1. That a school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for targeted support and improvement.
2. That a school, in addition to no longer meeting the eligibility criteria for targeted support and improvement, has established a growth trajectory for the identified student demographic group to bring its performance into alignment with the state's long-term goals.
3. That the school has a strong plan for sustainability of the progress that it has made that articulates a clear rationale for what it proposes to sustain, including a theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and a robust progress monitoring plan. This sustainability plan must explain how the school will maintain a strong rate of growth and change for P-12 students, as applicable depending upon school configuration¹²⁸ and including transitions from one school site to another while addressing how the school intends to ensure sustainability with reduced services, supports, and/or funding.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ For instance, the Early Learning Council recommends that this plan include ways of ensuring Kindergarten readiness and how to sustain those gains through the early elementary years. Additional information on the sustainability plan required for exiting services will be shared with districts as ESSA begins implementation.

¹²⁹ Comments and suggestions made by the Consortium for Educational Change, based on its experience supporting school improvement in schools awarded School Improvement 1003(g) Grants, influenced the addition of criteria 2 and 3.

Schools will have one optional planning year and up to three years of full implementation of targeted support and improvement plans before being expected to meet these exit criteria. Schools who are identified in 2018-19 and who opt to take a planning year would need to meet these criteria by 2022-23. Schools that do not opt to take a planning year would be expected to meet these criteria by 2021-22. ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of quarterly reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets. Schools that are not making reasonable progress will work with ISBE to determine additional interventions.¹³⁰

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.

School Improvement Resources. Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.

Meet Responsibilities

Illinois will meet its responsibilities by:

- i. Collecting and applying computational algorithms appropriate to identify schools that require comprehensive or targeted support and services.
- ii. Notifying identified schools of their eligibility, responsibilities, and the available system of supports and services;
- iii. Distributing funds to identified schools based on identified need that Illinois will develop, in collaboration with stakeholders, during the available transition year.

Award Funds

Illinois will use its transition year and some portion of the available funds to develop, in collaboration with stakeholders, the state formula for allotment of funds and services to LEAs that have schools identified for comprehensive and/or targeted supports¹³¹. In

¹³⁰ Within the IL-EMPOWER structure, a Tier 4: Lowest Performing School would not be able to be identified for comprehensive services indefinitely. At the same time, the type of intervention would be dependent on the specific elements within the improvement plan that, over time, were not met. In the case of a school receiving comprehensive services that is unable to meet targets, ISBE will work directly with the school to determine the necessary supports and resources outside the IL-EMPOWER structure that will aid in school improvement.

¹³¹ When asked how a formula could be used to distribute funds both equitably and effectively, stakeholders suggested the formula should incorporate the following elements: Status for comprehensive (Tier 4: Lowest-Performing School) or targeted (Tier 3: Underperforming School) support, with schools requiring comprehensive supports receiving a larger allotment of funds and/or services than targeted; the number of staff and students in the

addition, Illinois will utilize some of its funds to design and implement a rigorous review and approval process for external providers that will become part of the IL-EMPOWER network.

Monitor and Evaluate the Use of Funds

Illinois will utilize the transition year to align its reporting structures and monitoring and evaluation processes to those of other federally funded programs to improve the effectiveness of the agency and reduce the burden of monitoring activities on schools and districts. In addition, IL-EMPOWER Provider Partners will be expected to contribute to research on the effectiveness of strategies implemented in schools responsible for comprehensive or targeted improvement, such that their work expands the available evidence base, particularly for diverse geographic and demographic contexts.

- A. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions.** Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and, if applicable, the list of state-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

As the statewide system of support to help all districts and schools improve, IL-EMPOWER will provide the *structure* through which schools will be able to select an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner(s) and receive services. The structure of IL-EMPOWER is predicated on schools identifying areas where they need support as well schools selecting a vendor who can best assist in meeting those areas of need to improve student outcomes. Prior to identifying and utilizing an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, a school must complete a needs assessment/equity audit. The audit is required and is the basis for all future work. The results of the audit will allow schools to select the most appropriate provider for their needs, establish a work plan identifying targets, and create a timeline to meet improvement targets. Targets must be identified in one or more of the following areas: Governance and Management, Curriculum and Instruction, and Climate and Culture.

school; the phase of the implementation timeline the school is in (e.g., year 1, year 2, or year 3); the number of schools in the LEA identified for comprehensive services and the number identified for targeted services; the concentration (i.e., percentage of schools in the LEA) identified for comprehensive or targeted services; the level of “need” of the school and district; and the quality of the plan itself and readiness of the schools and districts to implement the plan effectively. The rationale for the inclusion of aforementioned elements in the formula is that the statute requires that ISBE prioritize LEAs that “demonstrate the greatest need for such funds” and “demonstrate the strongest commitment to using funds.”

ISBE will monitor the school's improvement plans to ensure that they are on track to meet improvement targets or, if a school is not meeting performance targets, assist in amending improvement plans to focus specifically on areas inhibiting improvement.

The IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner will be pre-approved by ISBE to offer particular services at a specific cost. ISBE will work with vendors to establish the specific cost for services so that schools and Provider Partners will not need to do so. Schools will have four years in which to demonstrate consistent improvement in identified areas (one year for planning and three years for implementation).¹³²

In order to serve as an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, an organization must apply and be pre-approved to offer services in one or more of the aforementioned categories. Applicants for pre-approval must provide:

- Evidence of success in the delivery and sustainability of school improvement services.
- Information on or evidence of the development of services in areas including, but not limited to, Data Competency, Resource Management, Continuous Improvement, and Sustainability.
- Information or organizational capacity.

Once pre-approval of vendors occurs and after schools are identified for supports in 2018-2019 school year, the next steps for a school identified for comprehensive support are:

1. Upon notification from ISBE will begin completing a needs assessment/equity audit.
2. At the conclusion of the needs assessment/equity audit, the school shall submit the data gleaned from the needs assessment/equity audit along with the identification of vendors who could support the school with its identified needs or equity gaps to ISBE.
3. ISBE will ensure that the identified vendor¹³³ has the capacity to assist the school.¹³⁴

¹³² The determination for a four-year timeframe was recommended by stakeholders (one year of planning, three for implementation) as well as is the greatest length of time allowed for this work in ESSA.

¹³³ As identified in the introduction to the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, there is the possibility, within the IL-EMPOWER structure, that schools and districts within Illinois can serve as partners for schools that require support. Schools that have received a Tier I - Exemplary School or Tier II – Commendable School can engage in this work and receive funding to do so. As indicated by Superintendent Smith at the February 2017 Illinois State Board of Education meeting, peer coaching and mentoring will grow as ESSA implementation continues.

¹³⁴ To be clear, it may be that a pre-approved vendor is working with a number of schools. At the time of a specific schools submission of information/data to ISBE, that vendor may be at capacity based upon the information submitted at the time of application. If this is the case, ISBE will work with the school to identify another appropriate vendor.

4. The school and vendor will develop a work plan that includes targets and dates and submit to ISBE for approval.

95% of TI funds identified for school improvement must flow to the districts. The supports identified through the needs assessment and equity audit as well as the cost proposal submitted as part of the pre-approval process will allow ISBE to grant the appropriate amount of funding to each school or district.¹³⁵ ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of quarterly reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets as well as utilizing field-based staff who can, if necessary, provide technical assistance and monitor for compliance. Schools that are not making reasonable progress will work directly with ISBE to determine additional interventions.¹³⁶

Member of the Illinois State Board of Education will be provided an annual report that including evidence of provider impact before any renewal is approved.

ISBE will support/interact with LEAs by:

1. Notifying LEA/schools of eligibility,
2. Notifying LEA/schools of responsibilities,
3. Supporting LEA/schools in the connection with IL-EMPOWER providers,¹³⁷
4. Utilizing ISBE IL-EMPOWER Network (ISBE staff¹³⁸ and IL-EMPOWER Provider Partners) in supporting LEA/schools in strong improvement plan development as well as connecting districts with each other in order to provide assistance and guidance.

¹³⁵ The IL-EMPOWER structure allows for the selection of a vendor to serve multiple schools within the same region. Approaching the work in this way assumes that schools have identified the same needs and similar targets.

¹³⁶ Within the IL-EMPOWER structure, a Tier 4: Lowest Performing School would not be able to be identified for comprehensive services indefinitely. At the same time, the type of intervention would be dependent on the specific elements within the improvement plan that, over time, were not met. In the case of a school receiving comprehensive services that is unable to meet targets, ISBE will work directly with the school to determine the necessary supports and resources outside the IL-EMPOWER structure that will aid in school improvement.

¹³⁷ Completion of the IBAM Quality Framework, completed prior to the initiation of services, shall assist schools with selecting the most appropriate supports.

¹³⁸ ISBE staff will work with district personnel to identify schools/districts that can share their expertise with other schools/districts in order to take advantage of the wide range of expertise found in Illinois schools.

Eligible LEA/schools may access the differentiated supports and services of IL EMPOWER organized by the following foundational drivers of improvement:

- **Governance and Management:** Systems change efforts (e.g., effective policy development and implementation, diagnostic supports and services, data literacy, continuous improvement processes, organizational leadership, resource management, capacity-building practices, communication planning);
- **Curriculum and Instruction:** Supports administrator and educator development (e.g., teaming processes, facilitation of continuous learning and development, instructional practices, resource allocation, reflective supervision, instructional technology, data information literacy, recruitment and retention of teachers);
- **Culture and Climate:** Emphasizes environment and supports needed for the sustainability of a safe school where productive work can occur (e.g., data competency, resource management, building leadership capacity, cultural awareness, communication strategies, professional learning communities, Universal Design for Learning, social and emotional learning).

B. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the state's exit criteria within a state-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).

ISBE is compiling a list of resources that it will share with the field in the spring of 2017 in order to support districts and schools in their selection of "evidence-based practices" for the purposes of school improvement. Schools identified for support that do not meet the state-determined exit criteria will be supported in selecting contextually appropriate, evidence-based practices that have more rigorous levels of evidence supporting their effectiveness. The LEA will be supported in establishing a strong program monitoring system to ensure that the selected practices are implemented with high levels of fidelity.

Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or that fail to meet the state's exit criteria will be required to partner with an ISBE-approved IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner and use their 1003 funding for intensive professional learning, technical assistance, coaching, and mentoring.

Periodic Resource Review. Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).

An analysis was completed in 2014 for the State Performance Plan-State Systemic Improvement Plan Process. In planning for ESSA, ISBE will complete an updated internal infrastructure analysis to review its systems, data, and practices utilized for LEA support. This analysis will then be conducted beginning in 2018-19 and will be reviewed annually for updates and revisions.

ISBE proposes that every three years, starting in the year following the identification of schools for comprehensive services (e.g., at the end of a planning year), Illinois will review state, federal, and other programmatic resource allocations for each LEA serving one or more schools identified either for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The review will include an analysis of:

- Investments in early learning (federal, state, local funds).
- Equity gaps in funding per student of General State Aid.
- Equity gaps in Title allocations, including section 1003 funds, supports, and services.
- Equity gaps in special education allocations from IDEA Parts B and D.
- Equity gaps in funding to gifted and talented grant programs.
- Equity gaps in bilingual education funding.
- Equity gaps in access and provision of educator loan repayment grants.
- Gaps in the provision of all technical assistance, professional development, and other support and services provided by agency staff.
- Gaps in the provision of all technical assistance, professional development, and other support and services provided by IL-EMPOWER.
- Gaps in the impact of funding, supports and services, relative to allocation, for all students, relevant student groups, and teachers (e.g., gifted, fine arts, library and media specialists, school service personnel, and career and technical educators and programming).

The review will follow the processes used by Illinois to establish its State Systemic Improvement Plan process and develop its Equity Plan. (See Appendix F.) The review will present data comparing allocations between LEAs and between schools and consider any inequities identified in school support and improvement plans. Following this review, the state will engage stakeholders to determine the most appropriate strategies and take other actions, to the extent practical, to address any resource inequities identified during its review.

DRAFT

Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators

5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement.

Teachers able to meet the needs of the whole child throughout her or his school journey and who serve as mentor and guide are the cornerstones of Illinois public schools. Moreover, supporting the development of educators from pre-service work through the sharing of experience to mentor and teach other professional educators as a more seasoned teacher is the responsibility of schools, professional organizations, and ISBE. In order to best ensure this work is meaningful, the use of Title II dollars must be utilized in ways that support the long-term student goals.

As previously stated, the long-term student performance goals for ISBE include:

- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.

In addition to these performance goals, two additional ISBE goals identify the importance of where the work occurs and who serves as the cornerstone of a child's learning:

- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

ISBE believes if a child is supported in achieving the aforementioned performance goals and the centrality of the educator and environment in creating a space for this work to occur that there is a far greater likelihood that the larger state goal that by 2025, 60 percent of Illinoisans will possess a high-quality credential or degree. Creating a system where students are supported in the learning and have the ability to easily access postsecondary opportunities of interest is good for the individual and good for Illinois.

To achieve these goals, ISBE recognizes the central role that administrators, teachers, school service personnel, and other licensed and non-licensed staff play in supporting each and every child in her or his growth. Thus, ISBE must ensure that educators are supported in their professional learning so they, in turn, can support children throughout the continuum of early childhood through postsecondary education and

career. To this end, ISBE has a number of initiatives supporting the professional learning of educators and school leaders.

***Instructions:** Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if an SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.*

- A. Certification and Licensure Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders?
- ☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the systems for certification and licensure below.
- ☒ No.
- B. Educator Preparation Program Strategies.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's strategies to improve educator preparation programs consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(M) of the ESEA, particularly for educators of low-income and minority students?
- ☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the strategies to improve educator preparation programs below.
- ☒ No.

5.2 Support for Educators.

***Instructions:** Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if the SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.*

- A. Resources to Support State-level Strategies.** Describe how the SEA will use Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support state-level strategies designed to:
- Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging state academic standards;
 - Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;
 - Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and
 - Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the educator equity provisions in 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c).

Currently, ISBE is focused on providing resources (Title I) and training to teachers regarding the Illinois Learning Standards (Title IIa funds), mentoring for principals of low-performing schools (Title I, Part 1003a), induction and mentoring for new teachers (state funds), and training on teacher and principal evaluations (Title IIa). So, too, through partnership with Regional Offices of Education, ISBE has developed and

delivered professional development through Foundational Services. Foundational Services were developed and refined over time to share up-to-date information on ISBE initiatives (e.g., ELA and math, teacher evaluation, balanced assessment, family and community engagement). Data suggests that educators have found this professional development useful, but it lacks coordination and the ability to differentiate services based upon district need. Because of this, ISBE must better coordinate its initiatives within and outside of the agency to maximize the impact of professional learning across Illinois in order to increase student achievement.

There are a multitude of professional development opportunities available to districts, many of which are of high quality. However, ISBE sees an opportunity in ESSA to deliberately move from “one and done” or “sit and get” models of professional development to a system wherein professional learning is the gold standard. To be clear, this is not only an issue of language. Rather, Illinois has adopted the Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning. Moreover, ISBE expects that LEAs, to the extent practical, will engage in professional learning that is led by teachers, embedded by administrators, focused on at-risk subgroups as well as transitions between grades, schools, and into and out of schooling (e.g., entry into kindergarten, between elementary and middle school, middle school and high school, and high school and postsecondary), and focused on considering student level and teacher evaluation data for the purposes of LEA planning.¹³⁹ These standards provide a frame in which learning opportunities should be robust and have the opportunity for both application and reflection on the part of the educator. In order for this to occur, ISBE is committed to ensuring that the goal of the 2015 Illinois Equity Plan -- that each and every child in an Illinois school is taught by a highly effective educator -- is supported through professional learning opportunities and high-quality resources.¹⁴⁰

The following work, some of which is ongoing¹⁴¹, will be developed and delivered utilizing Title II funds and braiding and/or blending other fund sources when applicable and appropriate.¹⁴²

Professional Learning and Resources for Educators

¹³⁹ ISBE will modify its Title II application to collect information on the intended and actual use of Title II dollars for professional learning.

¹⁴⁰ In addition to the importance of developing and supporting multiple avenues of entry for those who wish to teach, ISBE recognizes the importance of establishing a teacher pipeline. In 2013, the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness subcommittee of the P20 Council submitted a proposal to ISBE for the establishment of a diverse educator pipeline. As requested in that document, ISBE released a Request for Information to which 12 organizations submitted material. In addition, to show the commitment of ISBE to this work, beginning in FY 2015, ISBE has annually included a budget (\$700,000) to support this work. The line has yet to be funded.

¹⁴¹ As monitoring data is collected and analyzed, the professional learning needs of educators will, in all likelihood, change. To that end, ISBE will track the needs of the field in order to remain nimble to the identified needs.

¹⁴² So, too, many of the specific areas identified in this section will be included in the work of IL-EMPOWER.

ISBE understands the importance of job-embedded professional learning¹⁴³. To that end, as the ESSA State Plan for Illinois is implemented, ISBE is committed to using Title II dollars in order to:

- Build the content knowledge of educators regarding the Illinois Learning Standards in core content areas and characteristics of learners;¹⁴⁴
- Develop resources on supporting learning environments and transition throughout the continuum of early childhood through college and career (Title II and Title I);
- Develop resources and professional learning opportunities for educators on Universal Design for Learning, differentiated instruction, balanced assessment, and data and assessment literacy (Title I, Title II, Title III and IDEA funding);
- Continue to build upon the resources for family/caretaker and community engagement; social and emotional learning; cultural, racial, and socio-economic competence; conflict management; trauma and behavioral health issues; restorative practices; cultural competence; anti-racism; recognizing implicit bias; and actualizing anti-bias approaches (Title I, Title II, Title III and IDEA funding);
- Continue to support training for teacher and principal evaluators (Title II and state funding); and
- Districts, especially those identified for comprehensive and targeted services, will, through IL-EMPOWER, be provided access to professional learning opportunities that include an emphasis on Governance and Management, Curriculum and Instruction, Climate and Culture. More specifically, capacity-building strategies, with an emphasis on sustainability, will be emphasized (Title I, School Improvement, Title II, IDEA, Title IV Part A and B, State Longitudinal Data Systems funding).

¹⁴³ In addition to the information shared in this section, ISBE will provide LEA guidance regarding professional learning that is most likely to be effective, aligned to adult learning best practice, is evidence-based, and has been demonstrated to be effective in developing knowledge and improving practice and/or outcomes for students.

¹⁴⁴ For instance, this includes, but is not limited to, the identification and appropriate supports for gifted children, English Learners, and children with other identified needs. It also includes an emphasis on supporting the social and emotional development of each and every child and resource development in core content areas that emphasizes the tenets of differentiated instruction (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, fine arts, physical education, and foreign language).

Teacher Residency Program

Illinois, like most every other state, has seen a significant decrease in the number of individuals who attend a college or university in order to obtain licensure to teach. Thus, considering multiple avenues of entry into the profession of teaching is important in order to afford individuals with a sense of calling and connection to specific communities the opportunity to become licensed to teach.

ISBE committed to supporting the development of teacher residencies and is currently working to identify any modifications to statute necessary as well as identifying funds in order for this work to proceed. As that work progresses, ISBE will develop a Request for Proposal for an Innovative Fieldwork competitive grant program. The purpose of this program is to provide funding for districts and institutions of higher education with approved teacher preparation programs to partner and develop innovative approaches to fieldwork requirements in order to provide candidates rich and extended opportunities to work with, learn from, and practice their developing craft with practicing teachers. This work will be shared throughout the state and beyond. Additional information on the application requirements will be forthcoming in spring 2017.

School Leaders and Administrators

ISBE understand the importance of shared leadership within schools and districts in Illinois. School leaders include superintendents, principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders, and, when appropriate, LEA leaders.¹⁴⁵ To this end, ISBE shall:

- Continue to support an educator leader network (ELN) to connect leaders between districts. These funds will be coordinated with state funding (Title II and state funding).
- Develop a competitive grant program wherein districts will propose 30-60-90 day research projects. These projects will assist Illinois in continuing to be a leader in advocacy for and approaches to teacher leadership, in particular. More specifically, in a 30-60-90 project, a district, school, or portion of faculty will propose a problem of practice important to teacher leadership at the school and/or district, develop a plan in which the problem of practice is investigated, and

¹⁴⁵ Additional clarification on this definition was provided by the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness subcommittee of the P20 Council.

report findings. This work will be used to increase clarity on the roles and work of a teacher leader. This work will be shared through ELN among other spaces.¹⁴⁶

- Create resources emphasizing the school leaders as instructional leaders, particularly for teachers in the early grades. School leaders need knowledge of child development, pedagogical content knowledge, differentiation of instruction, and knowledge of pedagogical practice and high-impact teacher-child interactions for young children (Title II, Early Childhood).
- Provide school leaders with opportunities to build their capacity as facilitators of continuous teacher learning and development (Title II).
- Professional learning opportunities provided to school leaders, especially those identified for comprehensive services and through IL-EMPOWER, may include strategies regarding family and community engagement, as well as the use of referral mechanisms that link children to appropriate services.

B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs. Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students, consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(J) of the ESEA.

In addition to the information provided previously, ISBE will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students through systematic professional learning, training, technical assistance, and coaching that allows for differentiated services to LEAs through IL-EMPOWER, the Illinois Data FIRST project, Ed360, the Illinois Virtual School, and Online Impact.¹⁴⁷

As the statewide system of support to help all districts and schools improve, IL-EMPOWER will provide the *structure* through which schools will be able to select an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner(s) and receive services. The structure of IL-EMPOWER is predicated on schools identifying areas where they need support as well schools selecting a vendor who can best assist in meeting those areas of need to improve student outcomes. Prior to identifying and utilizing an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, a school must complete a needs assessment/equity audit. The audit is required and is the basis for all future work. The results of the audit will allow schools to select the most appropriate provider for their needs, establish a work plan identifying targets, and create a

¹⁴⁶ The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness subcommittee of the P20 Council has recommended pilot programs for both teacher residencies as well as school leaders. ISBE is continuing to ascertain the feasibility of one or both of these in the near future.

¹⁴⁷ While ISBE collects limited data on some of these initiatives, it intends to use the opportunity of ESSA to develop a more robust feedback loop to ensure relevance and quality of services.

timeline to meet improvement targets. Targets must be identified in one or more of the following areas: Governance and Management, Curriculum and Instruction, and Climate and Culture.

ISBE will monitor the school 's improvement plans to ensure that they are on track to meet improvement targets or, if a school is not meeting performance targets, assist in amending improvement plans to focus specifically on areas inhibiting improvement.

The IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner will be pre-approved by ISBE to offer particular services at a specific cost. ISBE will work with vendors to establish the specific cost for services so that schools and Provider Partners will not need to do so. Schools will have four years in which to demonstrate consistent improvement in identified areas (one year for planning and three years for implementation).¹⁴⁸

In order to serve as an IL-EMPOWER Provider Partner, an organization must apply and be pre-approved to offer services in one or more of the aforementioned categories. Applicants for pre-approval must provide:

- Evidence of success in the delivery and sustainability of school improvement services.
- Information on or evidence of the development of services in areas including, but not limited to, Data Competency, Resource Management, Continuous Improvement, and Sustainability.
- Information on organizational capacity.

Once pre-approval of vendors occurs and after schools are identified for supports in 2018-2019 school year, the next steps for a school identified for comprehensive support are:

1. Upon notification from ISBE will begin completing a needs assessment/equity audit.
2. At the conclusion of the needs assessment/equity audit, the school shall submit the data gleaned from the needs assessment/equity audit along with the identification of vendors who could support the school with its identified needs or equity gaps to ISBE.
3. ISBE will ensure that the identified vendor¹⁴⁹ has the capacity to assist the school.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ The determination for a four-year timeframe was recommended by stakeholders (one year of planning, three for implementation) as well as is the greatest length of time allowed for this work in ESSA.

¹⁴⁹ As identified in the introduction to the ESSA State Plan for Illinois, there is the possibility, within the IL-EMPOWER structure, that schools and districts within Illinois can serve as partners for schools that require support. Schools that have received a Tier I - Exemplary School or Tier II – Commendable School can engage in this work and receive funding to do so. As indicated by Superintendent Smith at the February 2017 Illinois State Board of Education meeting, peer coaching and mentoring will grow as ESSA implementation continues.

¹⁵⁰ To be clear, it may be that a pre-approved vendor is working with a number of schools. At the time of a specific schools submission of information/data to ISBE, that vendor may be at capacity based upon the information

4. The school and vendor will develop a work plan that includes targets and dates and submit to ISBE for approval.

95% of TI funds identified for school improvement must flow to the districts. The supports identified through the needs assessment and equity audit as well as the cost proposal submitted as part of the pre-approval process will allow ISBE to grant the appropriate amount of funding to each school or district.¹⁵¹ ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of quarterly reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets as well as utilizing field-based staff who can, if necessary, provide technical assistance and monitor for compliance. Schools that are not making reasonable progress will work directly with ISBE to determine additional interventions.¹⁵²

Member of the Illinois State Board of Education will be provided an annual report that including evidence of provider impact before any renewal is approved.

The Illinois Data FIRST project includes a series of interrelated efforts that will enable state policymakers, educators, learners, and members of the public to access information from the Illinois Longitudinal Data System (ILDS) to more efficiently support and improve state and local resource allocations, instruction, and learner outcomes. Illinois has built and deployed the fundamental components of the ILDS and has established a robust interagency ILDS governance system. Illinois Data FIRST will connect resource allocation information to student outcomes and educator information and significantly expand the use of ILDS for intuitive and “real-time” instructional feedback.

Illinois Data FIRST has two components: Fiscal Equity and Return on Investment and Instructional Support. A key outcome of the Instructional Support component is to deliver a comprehensive and high-quality educator dashboard suite, including district-, school-, teacher-, and student-level details, to support data-informed administrative and instructional decisions.

submitted at the time of application. If this is the case, ISBE will work with the school to identify another appropriate vendor.

¹⁵¹ The IL-EMPOWER structure allows for the selection of a vendor to serve multiple schools within the same region. Approaching the work in this way assumes that schools have identified the same needs and similar targets.

¹⁵² Within the IL-EMPOWER structure, a Tier 4: Lowest Performing School would not be able to be identified for comprehensive services indefinitely. At the same time, the type of intervention would be dependent on the specific elements within the improvement plan that, over time, were not met. In the case of a school receiving comprehensive services that is unable to meet targets, ISBE will work directly with the school to determine the necessary supports and resources outside the IL-EMPOWER structure that will aid in school improvement.

ISBE is launching an educator dashboard, Ed360. Ed360 is being developed incrementally to allow preK-12 stakeholders to access an initial set of data while additional data sets, functions, and reports continue to be added based on stakeholder feedback. ISBE plans to integrate Ed360 with existing technology in school districts to enable a single sign-on solution. In addition, Ed360 will use existing data collections to populate the dashboards.

Ed360 is available at the state, regional, district, school, and classroom levels. Ed360, which is also connected to the Illinois Open Education Resource platform, will have a formative assessment expansion with additional professional learning focusing on:

- Identifying and/or developing formative and summative assessments,
- Using technology and tools in the classroom,
- Content resources, including guidance on how to use resources developed to improve student achievement, and
- Professional learning regarding behavioral and mental health, equity, and diversity issues to support healthier school environments.

In addition to credit recovery and access to Advanced Placement courses for students, the Illinois Virtual School (IVS), which began in 2001, has been providing free and low-cost, self-paced online professional development to Illinois teachers on a variety of topics, including teaching blended learning courses, understanding mobile learning, and reading courses for K-3 teachers. Facilitated courses do cost more, but generally include graduate credit.

ISBE also supports Online Impact, an online professional development site that will allow teachers to expand their knowledge, explore new teaching strategies, and develop new pedagogical skills in a time frame that is convenient for them. This is available for Illinois K-12 educators. Online Impact offers workshops that help educators throughout Illinois stay up to date on new and emerging educational trends and develop new skills that will foster continued success in the classroom. Currently, there are 15 online professional development courses that have been offered.

5.3 Educator Equity.

ISBE has requested an extension for calculating statewide rates using student level data for the differences in the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority/non-minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. This data will be available in October 2017.

The 2015 Illinois Equity Plan is located in Appendix C.

- A. Definitions.** Provide the SEA’s different definitions, using distinct criteria, for the following key terms:

Key Term	Statewide Definition (or Statewide Guidelines)
Ineffective teacher*	A teacher who has received a “needs improvement” on an evaluation and, in a subsequent evaluation, received a rating of “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement.”
Out-of-field teacher*+	A teacher teaching in a grade or content area for which he or she does not hold the appropriate state-issued license or endorsement
Inexperienced teacher*+	A teacher with less than two years of teaching experience.
Low-income student	Students from families receiving public aid, living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, being supported in foster homes with public funds, or eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.
Minority student	A person who is 1) American Indian or Alaska Native, 2) Asian, 3) Black or African American, 4) Hispanic or Latino, or 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (HB 332 effective 1/1/12).

*Definitions of these terms must provide useful information about educator equity.

+Definitions of these terms must be consistent with the definitions that a state uses under 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

- B. Rates and Differences in Rates.** In Appendix B, calculate and provide the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A using the definitions provided in section 5.3.A. The SEA must calculate the statewide rates using student-level data.

ISBE is requesting an extension in calculating statewide rates using student level data for the differences in the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority/non-minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. (Please see Appendix C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION.)

- C. Public Reporting.** Provide the web address or URL of, or a direct link to, where the SEA will publish and annually update, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(4):
- The rates and differences in rates calculated in 5.3.B;
 - The percentage of teachers categorized in each LEA at each effectiveness level established as part of the definition of “ineffective teacher,” consistent with applicable state privacy policies;
 - The percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37; and
 - The percentage of teachers categorized as inexperienced teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

ISBE is designing a webpage that will include this information. The web address will be:
<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/EssaEducatorEquity.aspx>

- D. Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the likely causes (*e.g.*, teacher shortages, working conditions, school leadership, compensation, or other causes), which may vary across districts or schools, of the most significant statewide differences in rates in 5.3.B. The description must include whether those differences in rates reflect gaps between districts, within districts, and within schools.

ISBE is requesting an extension in calculating student level data for the differences in the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority/non-minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. (Please see Appendix C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION.)

- E. Identification of Strategies.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, provide the SEA's strategies, including timelines and federal or non-federal funding sources, that are:
- Designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences identified in 5.3.D and
 - Prioritized to address the most significant differences in the rates provided in 5.3.B, including by prioritizing strategies to support any schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 that are contributing to those differences in rates.

ISBE is requesting an extension in calculating student level data for the differences in the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority/non-minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. (Please see Appendix C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION.)

Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences in Rates	Strategies (Including Timeline and Funding Sources)

- F. Timelines and Interim Targets.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the SEA's timelines and interim targets for eliminating **all** differences in rates.

ISBE is requesting an extension in calculating student level data for the differences in the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority/non-minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. (Please see Appendix C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION.)

Difference in Rates	Date by which differences in	Interim targets, including date
---------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------

	rates will be eliminated	by which target will be reached

DRAFT

Section 6: Supporting All Students

6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students.

In order to best support schools in providing opportunities for a well-rounded education for each and every child, ISBE is dedicated to providing resources that enable schools to support the development of the whole child. This work consists of making sure that there are appropriate resources available to teach content in ways that afford multiple entries into curriculum as well as multiple ways to show their developing understandings.

As stated previously, the important work that occurs between teacher and student and the environment in which this work takes place supports two of the ISBE goals:

- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

So, too, without the teacher and a safe learning environment, the possibility of each and every child in Illinois to meet the performance goals set by ISBE would be far less. In this way, the work that shall occur through the use of Title II dollars and the opportunities available to Illinois students through Title IV is intertwined. ISBE encourages districts to prioritize funds based upon identified needs. ISBE will work directly with those schools identified for comprehensive services to ensure that appropriate programming is aligned with Title IV funding.

For instance, ISBE intends to use Perkins funding to support innovative, competency-based learning experiences with career technical education classrooms,¹⁵³ and it is of equal importance that the teachers mentoring students in each content area and school configuration are able to create a safe environment that affords students the opportunity to make mistakes and grow in competency and confidence as they continue their work.

Instructions: When addressing the state's strategies below, each SEA must describe how it will use Title IV, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of fund provided under those programs, to support state-level strategies and LEA use of funds. The strategies and uses of funds must be designed to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging state academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.

¹⁵³ ISBE will develop a competitive grant for districts that highlights innovative work that utilizes competency-based approaches to skill development and attainment. ISBE will work with other state agencies to connect this work with the employer community.

The descriptions that an SEA provides must include how, when developing its state strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the following specific subgroups of students:

- *Low-income students;*
- *Lowest-achieving students;*
- *English Learners;*
- *Children with disabilities;*
- *Children and youth in foster care;*
- *Migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school;*
- *Homeless children and youths;*
- *Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students identified under Title I, Part D of the ESEA, including students in juvenile justice facilities;*
- *Immigrant children and youth;*
- *Students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School program under section 5221 of the ESEA; and*
- *American Indian and Alaska Native students.*

- A. The state's strategies and how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student's education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to postsecondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out.

Illinois has a long tradition of local control and has adopted a standards-based approach, supplemented with technical assistance and the alignment of programs and funds, to support the continuum of a student's education. This continuum begins at birth and extends through to postsecondary education and careers.

All Illinois K-12 students have access to rigorous academic standards, which set high expectations for academic achievement. Illinois adopted new learning standards in all content areas. The Illinois Learning Standards¹⁵⁴ in math, science, social science, English language arts, fine arts, and physical education/health are intended to support collaborative, engaging, student-centered learning environments designed to unlock student potential. These standards promote both horizontal and vertical alignment of curriculum, which ensures effective transitioning between grade levels and increases the probability that all learners will be prepared to pursue and achieve, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.

¹⁵⁴ For additional information on the Illinois Learning Standards, please access <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Learning-Standards.aspx>.

The Illinois Learning Standards serve as a ground upon which ISBE provides resources and opportunities for professional learning for educators. The resources and opportunities themselves are essential when thinking about the necessary supports for each and every child insofar as the content identified in the learning standards is an important vehicle through which an educator can meet the individual needs of each and every child.

The Illinois Learning Standards and the strategic support and guidance given to LEAs and schools regarding effective implementation ensure appropriate promotion practices as all students attain mastery of the standards. A caring and supportive environment, one in which a child feels safe and cared for and where she or he can learn, decreases the risk of students dropping out by supporting multiple pathways to postsecondary education and careers.

More specifically, ISBE will use Title IV, Part A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants), Part B (21st Century Community Learning Centers), and Part F funds (Promise Neighborhoods and Full-Service Community School Programs) to coordinate state-level strategies in order to reduce exclusionary discipline, implement evidence-based behavioral health awareness training programs, expand access for school-based counseling and behavioral health programs, and improve outcomes of children living in the most distressed communities. These efforts will help ensure that each and every child, regardless of circumstance, has access to a well-rounded education in a safe, healthy, supportive, and drug free environment. Title funds will also be used to promote positive school climates and address childhood exposure to violence and the effects of trauma. These activities, in addition to the supports provided for the Illinois Learning Standards, are critical to address the needs of subgroups, such as homeless children and youth, neglected and delinquent children and others at risk, and create an ecology that supports and nurtures the whole child.

An ecology that supports and nurtures the whole child requires a coordinated approach to best ensure each and every child continues to develop and build upon the fundamental skills she or he already possess and those skills needed to succeed in school and beyond. In addition, coordination during transitions from early childhood through high school graduation must deliberately identify and provide supports necessary for children and families so that the child may thrive.¹⁵⁵ When children are nested within whole, healthy systems that consider the child's areas of strength, the areas where additional support and nurturing may be required and the multiple avenues from

¹⁵⁵ The Early Learning Council recommends and by way of example that individuals who work in ECE settings are trained and equipped to work with transition children from early intervention services and programs across the entirety of the school year. This work is especially important for two reasons: to aid in the smooth transition of the child and her or his parents/caregivers from one system into the next as well as to ensure those children that require additional services are able to receive these in a timely fashion.

where that support should occur are more likely to be identified. This increases the likelihood for improved student achievement and better overall student well-being.

Providing each and every student in Illinois' schools access to personalized, rigorous learning experiences -- beyond the Illinois Learning Standards -- is essential in order for a young person to explore interests and develop a sense of competence and sense of self. There are many opportunities for this to occur within Illinois' public schools. ISBE's strategic use of funds offers students a variety of academic and career and technical content in the public secondary setting in Illinois. Some courses are articulated with the postsecondary level and others provide dual credit opportunities for students, where applicable. Career pathways are available in 99 percent of the school districts in Illinois and are facilitated by the Education for Employment Regional Delivery System. These career pathways or programs of study include industry partnerships, a sequence of coursework, work-based learning experiences, credentials/certifications, career and technical student organizations, individualized career plans, dual and/or articulated credit, and other related pathway experiences. These activities help to connect secondary to postsecondary to careers for students.

In addition, ISBE believes that parent, family, and community engagement is a cornerstone of effective schools and a critical element for a child's education and well-being in order to ensure that the needs of the whole child are met. ISBE has an intra-agency collaborative team charged with developing greater cohesiveness and efficiency in this work. This team has developed a shared definition for family engagement: Meaningful family engagement is based on the premise that parents, educators, and community members share responsibility for the academic, physical, social, emotional, and behavioral development of youth. This helps to frame the supports developed for ISBE, LEAs, and other key stakeholders. Family engagement is fostered through a deliberate process that is embraced throughout the school. It empowers adults to jointly support student growth, addresses any barriers to learning, and ensures college and career readiness. Foremost, effective family engagement systems, policies, and practices are mindful of diverse school-communities that are rich in language, culture, and school experiences. They are responsive to student and family needs.

To that end, the agency continues to build internal capacity and a number of supports for LEAs, schools, and communities. This includes updating the ISBE Family Engagement Framework and its companion tools. The current universal framework is designed for LEAs and schools including, but is not limited to, charter, alternative, and community schools. It provides guidance on how to develop meaningful partnerships with families by developing family engagement systems, building welcoming and supportive environments, enhancing communication with parents, and including parents in decision-making. The framework helps LEAs use family engagement as a strategy for

school improvement. Efforts to engage families in meaningful ways that are linked to learning and healthy development outcomes for students occur on an ongoing basis and are embedded in school policies and practices. Additional tools and resources will be integrated into the framework for more targeted and intensive individualized engagement with families of students with disabilities, EL students, students with behavioral health issues, and/or students with trauma.

ISBE will also continue to update and develop family engagement professional learning workshops available statewide to schools and districts through Foundational Services. The workshops and networking opportunities are aligned to the ISBE Family Engagement Framework. They are designed to help schools and districts partner with families so that they are more readily able to meet student achievement and healthy development goals, leverage resources, build effective relationships between parents and teachers, develop ongoing community support for school and district improvement, and meet federal and state requirements for family engagement. Family and community engagement is one of the core elements for the Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure and as such it is important that ISBE work to ensure that all families are supported through this work, especially those that are traditionally underserved (e.g., families who are homeless, migrant families, among others). The updated tools, professional learning opportunities, and resources will provide greater opportunities for meeting the accountability measures.

One such example is ISBE's English Language Learners Division published a guidance framework for schools and districts that integrated the four core principles of the ISBE Family Engagement Framework. The guidance document will be used to provide technical assistance. The division will also partner with external stakeholders, including WIDA and the Illinois Resource Center, to build capacity to engage EL families. There are a series of bilingual online trainings that are available to families to assist them in navigating the school system. ISBE will engage families, community members, schools, and districts through the Bilingual Statewide Advisory Council to ensure that the needs of EL families and communities in the education of bilingual students are met.

ISBE is pleased that there remains a set-aside requirement for parent and family engagement, with an allocation of more than \$500,000 in Title I funds. Ninety percent of those set-aside funds must be distributed to the schools, with a priority for high-need schools. ISBE staff will verify compliance with specific statutes regarding allowable use of funds during their review of the Title I grant. This information will be shared through a webinar. Also, staff, in consultation with educators and others from the community will continue to provide technical assistance and supports to ensure Title I funding that is dedicated for family engagement, works to strengthen school improvement efforts, ensures that there is ongoing communication, are offered at locations and at times that allow parents and families to attend without undue burden in order to build capacity for families in ways that are linked to learning and healthy development outcomes for students.

The Title Grants Administration Toolkit provides dates and sample letters districts can use to ensure they meet Parents Right-to-Know requirements. ISBE will ensure that at the beginning of each school year districts are aware of their obligation to notify Title I parents that a parent has the right to request information regarding the professional qualifications of the student's classroom teachers. In addition, a Title I school must also provide timely notice to a parent of a child who has been assigned or has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet applicable state certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned.

Also, Title IV, Part B funds will be used to build capacity of subgrantees as they implement high-quality after-school programs for students and families. ISBE recognizes that after-school programming oftentimes is the first entry point for family and community engagement in the school building. The professional development and technical assistance plan for 21st Century Community Learning Center grantees includes an annual comprehensive menu of supports for family and community engagement that includes webinars, regional workshops, newsletters, resource bulletins, a website, and two biannual conferences.

In addition, ISBE works closely with an Illinois after-school statewide network, the ACT Now Coalition, which recently published quality standards for Illinois after-school program providers. Almost 50 percent of the providers are LEAs and schools. This is significant, given that this leverages the ability to better coordinate resources, staff, and funding to strengthen engagement efforts. There are dedicated standards for family and community engagement as well as for school partnerships. ISBE will work with the network in providing professional development and a community of practice to strengthen local connection and capacity for meaningful engagement that is linked to learning and healthy development outcomes for students.

There are number of strategies that ISBE will be developing to continue and strengthen for young children and their families. Early Care and Education (ECE) providers can receive recognition of their work in family and community engagement from Early Childhood's Continuous Improvement Quality Rating System. This recognition boosts their quality rating and informs families of their quality practice. This gives families more opportunities to make informed decisions about their child's learning environment and the kinds of support they may receive as their child's first teacher.

ISBE, which has received a Preschool Expansion Grant, will work across the agency and in communities to build stronger systems and local capacity of ECE providers and families to better coordinate supports and increase confidence and opportunities for meaningful engagement.

ISBE is a key stakeholder on the Illinois Early Learning Council that, as a public-private partnership created by Public Act 93-380, strengthens, coordinates, and expands programs and services for children, birth to 5, throughout Illinois. There is a dedicated committee for family and community engagement that is working in partnership with ISBE to implement a strategic plan to support hard-to-reach families, help families achieve self-sufficiency goals, and support schools in better coordinating the transition for families when their children enter elementary school.

ISBE is also developing a framework for families in partnership with families, community resources, and faith-based partners because the agency recognizes that families are an integral part of a child's success from cradle to career. This work will align supports for children and families in efficient ways so community resources are strategically organized to support student success and so there is a focus on the whole child, integrating academics, services, supports, and opportunities. ISBE acknowledges the impact community resources and faith-based partners have in helping families become partners and leaders in supporting schools as well as their child's learning and healthy development. ISBE acknowledges the impact of the community school model as it embeds family engagement as a core pillar for school and student success. Community schools strengthen opportunities for schools and partners from across the community to come together to educate and support students and families in building thriving communities.

Family and community engagement is one of the central foci of the work of the Health and Human Services Transformation agenda and an integral part of the overall effort to build internal capacity and coordination for services targeting impacts for children and families statewide. ISBE, in partnership with the Governor's Office, will work to build stronger pathways for communication with families, community resources, and faith-based partners to optimize the efficacy of the work.

- B. The state's strategies and how it will support LEAs to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English Learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented. Such subjects could include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, or physical education.

ESSA places an unprecedented priority on the provision of supports for all young people struggling with barriers to learning, including programming that addresses academics along with the climate and culture of the school setting. Improving the educational outcomes for all students requires that schools -- the places where children spend most of their day -- promote the necessary conditions for learning, which include:

- A safe, caring, participatory, and responsive school/classroom climate;
- The development of academic, social, emotional, behavioral, and physical competencies;

- Effective and inclusive leaders;
- Ambitious instruction;
- Collaborative teachers;
- Supportive environment; and
- Involved families.

Barriers to learning and teaching, such as inadequate access to the general education curriculum, poverty, trauma, homelessness or instability in a living situation, disengagement, absenteeism, bullying, behavioral health issues, lack of or insufficient number of behavioral and physical health supports in the school environment (counselors, social workers, and school nurses), must be addressed.

Districts/schools need to provide programming at three levels of care and instruction (promotion, prevention, intervention) as they develop a safe, caring, (re-)engaging, and participatory environment. These levels:

- i. Foster the well-being of all students through universal schoolwide approaches (core standards-aligned academic curriculum and instruction and practices that promote healthy development and prevent issues);
- ii. Provide early intervention and identification strategies and supports to reduce the possibility of escalating issues (and evidence-based practices for content areas and social, emotional, behavioral, and physical supports), such as the use of early childhood mental health consultation, family support, and inclusion specialists;
- iii. Provide intensive, individualized supports for those students demonstrating complex, multi-faceted needs, including developmental screenings that could lead to additional supportive services.

All of this work needs to be done within an integrated manner throughout the school and with the support of resources from the local district (inclusive of school health centers¹⁵⁶, if available), community, and ISBE.

Illinois provides equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English Learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are generally underrepresented. ISBE embraces an educational model that offers a comprehensive educational program to meet each student's unique academic needs, learning styles, and interests. Providing a well-rounded education, including all areas in the Illinois Learning Standards, ensures that students have the knowledge and skills to fulfill this vision and be

¹⁵⁶ ISBE is collaborating with the Illinois Department of Health and Human Services to coordinate Medicaid dollars and the availability of health services at a school site for those children who may lack access to health care.

successful, globally engaged, and productive citizens. Struggling learners will be addressed through intervention strategies while advanced learners receive acceleration and enrichment based on individual student needs. In addition, school librarians support rigorous personalized learning experiences supported by technology and ensure equitable access to resources for all students.

For instance, ISBE supports these multiple pathways by providing funding and other program improvement-related resources to local districts through federal Carl D. Perkins Act of 2006 and state Career and Technical Education Improvement funds for approvable programs as defined by the state's program standards. These grants require equitable access. Illinois also provides specific funding and resources for Agricultural Education programs in local districts, of which a portion is based on attainment of quality indicators. State leadership projects also are in place to help address various career pathways in Illinois by providing resources to local districts as well. Pathway courses' content in Illinois is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards. Other standards are used in local districts to meet local needs, such as Common Career and Technical Core, and various content-specific national and/or industry standards. ESSA provides a unique opportunity to work in collaboration with the Perkins Act and other career programs to provide opportunities for each and every child.

As indicated previously, Illinois strives to increase student learning through the consistent practice of providing high-quality instruction matched to student needs. Implementation of a multi-tiered continuum of student supports is a collaborative effort involving all district staff, general educators, special educators, counselors, behavioral health staff, and bilingual/English language staff. Student strengths and needs should be identified and monitored continuously, with documented student performance data used to make instructional decisions. The process of such identification and continuous monitoring are the foundational pieces of a successful prevention system. It is through the continuous use of progress monitoring and analysis of student academic, social, emotional, behavioral, and physical growth that ISBE can collect and compile information from LEAs in order to ensure that dollars and programming are tied to the supports LEAs need to ensure that each and every child has regular access to educational opportunities.

ISBE seeks to improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. This will ensure that each and every child has regular opportunities to meet challenging state standards in developmentally appropriate ways.¹⁵⁷ ISBE is considering using Title IV, A dollars to support LEAs in offering all students, through the Illinois Virtual School,

¹⁵⁷ For instance, ECE students should have access to technology and this work should follow the joint guidelines from ED and the Department of Health and Human Services on technology and early education (<http://tech.edu.gov/early/learning/principles>)

direct access to standards- aligned courses for high school students, including AP and credit-recovery options.¹⁵⁸ In addition, LEAs will have access to the Illinois Open Education Resources project, a resource providing open, standards-aligned academic and career content to better allow for customized instructional opportunities for students.¹⁵⁹ Lastly, additional standards-aligned resources will be specifically designed to differentiate content for student consumption in order to increase academic achievement for each and every student by providing resources that are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate and responsive;

If an SEA intends to use Title IV, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for the activities that follow, the description must address how the state strategies below support the state-level strategies in 6.1.A and B.

- C. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce:
- i. Incidents of bullying and harassment;
 - ii. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and
 - iii. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

☐ No.

X Maybe

ISBE is considering using a portion of its 5 percent administrative set-aside from the Title IV allocation to fund a grant to support safe, healthy schools. This grant would provide support and technical assistance to the 855 districts in Illinois. ISBE is unable to commit to this grant at this time since allocations for Title IV have not been finalized.

- D. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

☐ No.

X Maybe.

ISBE is considering using a portion of its 5 percent administrative set-aside from the Title IV allocation to fund a grant to support innovative use technology in the classroom. This grant would provide support and technical assistance to the 855 districts in Illinois. ISBE is unable to commit to this grant at this time since allocations for Title IV have not been finalized.

¹⁵⁸ IVS is expanding its offerings to grades 3-12 during the 2017-18 school year in order to support LEAs in increasing access to coursework that may not be readily available in a student's home district.

¹⁵⁹ This work is currently being integrated with ISBE-provided district dashboards.

- E. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

☐ No.

X Maybe

ISBE is considering using a portion of its 5 percent administrative set-aside from the Title IV Part A allocation to fund a grant to support family engagement. This grant would provide support and technical assistance to the 855 districts in Illinois. ISBE is unable to commit to this grant at this time since allocations for Title IV Part A have not been finalized.

6.2 Program-Specific Requirements.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies

Describe the process and criteria that the SEA will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA that an LEA submits on behalf of a school, including how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school.

ISBE will use 20 percent poverty as the initial threshold for schools to receive consideration for the schoolwide waiver. This waiver allows schools with high percentages of students with poverty the flexibility to use Title I dollars serve the whole school. The current threshold for a school wide waiver is 40 percent students of poverty. Based on 2016 data, there are 816 schools under the 40 percent threshold. Using the 20 percent poverty threshold would allow approximately half of existing targeted assistance schools to utilize the schoolwide waiver (339 schools). Reasons that schools are not served may include lack of funding and/or the district did not want to offer targeted services. With the 20 percent poverty threshold, another 239 not served schools could take advantage of the schoolwide waiver. This would bring the total number of schools that could take advantage of the flexibility provided by the schoolwide waiver to 578 out of 816 or 70 percent of eligible schools. ISBE believes allowing schools with 20 percent poverty or more to apply to and receive a schoolwide waiver is aligned with the intent of the law and provides needed flexibility to schools.

The intent and purpose of ESSA is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and to close educational achievement gaps. Schoolwide flexibility allows a school to upgrade the entire educational program of a school that serves a high number of children from low-income families, in the instance of the waiver,

20 percent or more. The school will have to explain how taking advantage of the schoolwide waiver will allow them to use their funds to upgrade the entire educational program to provide a high quality education and close achievement gaps. As part of a simple waiver form, schools applying for this waiver would need to provide for the educational need to receive schoolwide status. Educational need will include the size and demographics of the school, the benefit the schoolwide status will provide to students and teachers, and how funding will be used differently schoolwide to impact more students, improved educational outcomes and close the achievement gap. More specifically, those schools with 20 percent poverty threshold or greater will need to provide information on the academic status of the students, budget, and other factors of the school. ISBE will provide a template that must be completed and approved.

Staff in the Title Grant Division review these waiver requests in context to the Districts Title I Plan, the Consolidated Application, and their unique knowledge of the circumstances of the district. This is to ensure the waiver is in the best interest of the students and the schools. Further, within the goals of the Title I plan and the schoolwide plan that is based on a comprehensive needs assessment, the school, district and ISBE will monitor their progress at improving the educational outcomes for kids. ISBE will continue to support all schools – including those that are not eligible for schoolwide programming, those that have not received a waiver to operate such a schoolwide program, or those that choose not to operate a schoolwide program – in addition to our schoolwide buildings.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.

- i. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a statewide basis, including the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and how the SEA will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the state on an annual basis.

For the purposes of the Migrant Education Program (MEP), eligible children/youth are defined as those who:

- Are younger than the age of 22 who have not earned a high school diploma or high school equivalency certificate from a granting institution in the United States; and
- Are migrant agricultural workers or fishers or have a parent, spouse, or guardian who is a migrant agricultural worker or fisher; and
- Have moved due to economic necessity from one school district to another; and

- Have changed residence within the preceding 36 months with/to join a parent, spouse, or guardian in order to obtain or seek temporary or seasonal employment in qualifying agricultural or fishing work.

Only certified MEP recruiters and individuals hired and trained by the Illinois Migrant Council or local MEP project can determine if a child/youth is eligible to be identified for MEP. Trained recruiters interview each family to determine program eligibility.

Illinois has a state identification and recruitment (ID&R) coordinator who oversees statewide activity to ensure that migrant recruiters cover the areas of the state where migrant families reside and reach out to all eligible populations, including preschool children and migratory youth who have dropped out of school. The state ID&R coordinator, in consultation with ISBE and local Illinois MEP operating agencies, develops, implements, and coordinates a plan to effectively identify and recruit all MEP-eligible children/youth residing in the state. The state ID&R coordinator works with a state recruiter as well as regional and local recruiters employed by local MEP projects to ensure that all MEP-eligible children and youth in the state are identified and recruited.

Qualified recruiters *must* complete identification and recruitment training each year to receive certification and participate in other scheduled training sessions, as required.

Recruiters document specified eligibility information on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and maintain records relating to identification and recruitment. Information used for eligibility and enrollment is gathered from self-eligible youth, parents/guardians, spouses, employers, social service agencies, and community members and organizations, documented on the COE, and entered into the migrant database, the New Generation System (NGS). NGS transmits data to the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) and also generates the counts of eligible migratory children for the Comprehensive State Performance Report that is submitted annually.

ID&R staff verify and document those individuals who may be eligible for services each September by contacting families previously recruited to verify and document the continued residency in the state of eligible migratory children from birth through 21 under a process called Residency Verification.

The coordinator oversees the state quality control efforts, which are designed to strengthen the accuracy of the ID&R processes through use of a variety of checks and balances. The Illinois quality control plan requires that the COE be checked by a local COE

reviewer and a state reviewer before the final eligibility determination is made. An annual re-interview process of a sample of families previously identified is carried out to verify the accuracy of the state eligibility determinations. Illinois has developed a comprehensive identification and recruitment manual, updated annually, that describes the responsibilities of recruiting staff and ensures high-quality practices in the state. (See Appendix G.)

In addition, recruiters serve as a link among the MEP, schools, parents/guardians, employers, and community agencies. The recruitment of MEP-eligible children and youth is the first step toward the provision of supplemental educational and supportive services by local operating agencies and the State of Illinois. Proper eligibility determinations ensure that eligible children and youth receive needed services. A coordinated statewide effort among key personnel responsible for identification and recruitment is critical to ensure that all MEP-eligible children and youth in the state are identified and recruited in order to obtain necessary supports.

- ii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.

Illinois developed a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) in 2015 as part of a continuous improvement process. It includes identification and an assessment of:

- The unique educational needs of migrant children that result from the children's migrant lifestyle; and
- Other needs of migrant students that must be met in order for them to participate effectively in school.

This analysis of needs provides a foundation for the future direction of the Illinois MEP through the service delivery planning process and supports the overall continuous improvement and quality assurance processes of the Illinois MEP and the overall ESSA State Plan for Illinois. The CNA serves as a springboard to set rigorous goals for the MEP and to better serve migrant students in Illinois. Doing so strengthens the plan.

The CNA will be updated periodically as necessary to respond to changes in the characteristics of the program and migrant population in Illinois. The CNA process will involve the collection and review of data on migrant student achievement and outcomes, the perceptions of migrant staff and parents related to migrant students' needs, and relevant demographic and evaluation data. A committee of stakeholders and experts will

use the data to formulate a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the migrant student population in Illinois and describe and quantify their needs as well as solution strategies to guide the MEP.

When children arrive during the summer, local and comprehensive summer school projects assess newly identified migrant children and youth to determine their individual strengths and areas for growth and support in mathematics and reading. Out-of-school youth who are not proficient in English take an English language proficiency screener. These assessment results are used to guide summer school instruction. During the regular school year, migrant students enroll in the local school and are screened and assessed with the instruments used for all students.

- iii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal educational programs.

A service delivery plan designed to address the needs identified in the CNA guides the implementation of the MEP. Each year, local projects provide services specified in the plan in communities where migrant families are living. Supplemental education and support services are provided to respond to the unique needs of migrant children and youth. These needs are not addressed through existing state, local, and federal educational programs, but the supplemental services are designed to provide continuity of instruction for students who move from one school district or state to another.

Many migrant children are present in Illinois only during the summer months and return to their home state during the school year. As a result, most MEP services are offered during the summer months through both center-based and home-based or itinerant programs.

These services include:

- Preschool developmentally appropriate programs designed to prepare migrant children for a successful school experience,
- Grades K-12 integrated classroom instruction – math; reading/language arts; English as a second language; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (summer school); and tutorial support (during the regular academic year),
- Secondary school services to assist high school students in achieving graduation, as well as postsecondary and career preparation,

- Outreach and instruction in GED preparation, life skills, and English as a second language for youths who have dropped out of school,
- Ancillary support services, including health, nutrition, and transportation, and
- Parent involvement activities.

During the regular school year, the local MEP project provides supplemental services, such as:

- Outreach and assistance to enroll in regular school year programs,
 - Supplemental instructional or tutorial support,
 - A migrant advocate who works with schools and families in areas of high concentration to make sure their needs are addressed, and
 - An annual meeting with the migrant staff, high school counselor, and the student to review and update the student's graduation plan.
- iv. Describe how the state and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the state will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year (*e.g.*, through use of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), among other vehicles).

Local operating agency data entry specialists enter information for eligible migrant children and youth in NGS. NGS files are transmitted daily to MSIX. NGS student records include demographics, enrollments, course history, health and immunization information, and assessment results. Illinois has established timelines for entry of information in line with the MSIX regulations. Local operating agencies use NGS and MSIX to gather information about newly arrived migrant children and youth to facilitate school placement and provision of appropriate services.¹⁶⁰

Illinois is part of several multistate consortia that seek to improve the identification and recruitment, policies, and educational services and programs for migrant students:

1. Two migrant incentive grant consortia: Identification & Recruitment Rapid Response Consortium and Graduation and Outcomes for Success for Out-of-School Youth.

¹⁶⁰ This includes children identified through migrant Head Start.

2. Illinois is part of the NGS consortium that collects and shares data among several states, including Texas, which is home to a large number of migrant families that come to Illinois.
3. Illinois also participates in MSIX.

Being part of these consortia has enabled Illinois to establish a system that ensures that school records are transferred from one school to another in a timely manner when migrant students cross state borders. Illinois is in contact with neighboring states to ensure that migrant students are identified and provided with services. Further, Illinois has developed relationships with school districts in sending states as well as other migrant programs, such as the Texas Migrant Interstate Program, to ensure continuity for migrant students who leave Illinois' schools in the middle of the academic year. Illinois administers the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) exam, which is the Texas state academic test, during the summer for migrant students required to take it.

- v. Describe the unique educational needs of the state's migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the state's most recent comprehensive needs assessment.

Based on the most recent CNA, the following are indicators of the unique education needs of Illinois migratory children:

For Reading and Mathematics

- The migrant student attainment in reading needs to increase by 25 percent to close the performance gap between migrant and non-migrant students.
- The migrant student attainment in math needs to increase by 25 percent to close the performance gap between migrant and non-migrant students.
- Migrant students need instruction and materials that work within the context of migrant programs where students enter and leave at different times.
- Migrant students need English language support in content area instruction at a higher rate than non-migrant students.

For School Readiness

- Migrant children need to increase alphabet and emergent literacy skills.
- Preschool migrant children need to increase math skills to prepare for school.

For High School Graduation and Services to Out-of-School Youth

- Attainment on state assessments needs to increase by 20 to 51 percent to close the performance gap between migrant and non-migrant students.
- The percentage of students completing math and English courses needs to increase by 13 percent.
- Migrant students need instruction and materials that work within the context of migrant programs where students enter and leave at different times.
- Migrant youth need to increase knowledge and abilities related to basic life skills and English language skills.

For Ancillary and Support Services

- MEP staff need to have the opportunity to receive training in methods of connecting content instruction to the diverse needs and backgrounds of migrant children.
- Migrant families need adequate access to transportation and nutrition resources.
- Migrant children and youth need to be screened for dental, health, and vision issues; problems that are identified need to be addressed.
- Migrant families need ideas for helping their children succeed in school, including ideas for helping in core content areas, navigating the school system, and preparing for postsecondary options.

Migrant families need access to educational materials and school supplies in the home.

- vi. Describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, Part C, and the strategies the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes consistent with section 1304(b)(1)(D) of the ESEA.

ISBE has established Measurable Program Outcomes to determine whether the program has met the unique educational needs of migrant children and youth as identified through the CNA for the following areas:

Reading and Mathematics

1a: Migrant students participating in a summer program for at least three weeks will demonstrate a statistically significant gain (at the .05 level) in reading/literacy between pre- and post-test using an appropriate performance-based reading/literacy assessment.

1b: Migrant students participating in the MEP regular year reading/literacy instructional services for at least three months will demonstrate a statistically significant gain (at the .05 level) in reading/literacy skills as measured by a classroom teacher survey that considers classroom performance, grades, and other indicators of reading/literacy achievement.

1c: Migrant students participating in a summer program for at least three weeks will demonstrate a statistically significant gain (at the .05 level) in math between pre- and post-test using an appropriate performance-based math assessment.

1d: Migrant students participating in the MEP regular year math instructional services for at least three months will demonstrate a statistically significant gain (at the .05 level) in math skills as measured by a classroom teacher survey that considers classroom performance, grades, and other indicators of math.

School Readiness

2a: Eighty percent of all preschool migrant students participating for at least three weeks in summer school programs will show a gain of 3.0 in the combined scores of the Emergent Literacy Skills and Alphabet subtests of the New York MEP Early Childhood Education (ECE) Assessment.

2b: Eighty percent of all preschool migrant students participating for at least three weeks in summer school programs will show a gain of 3.0 on the Counting subtest of the New York MEP ECE Assessment.

2c: Seventy-five percent of migrant children ages 3-5 participating in MEP Family Literacy for at least six months will show a standard score increase of 25 or more points between pre- and post-assessment on the New York MEP ECE Assessment.

High School Graduation and Services to Secondary-aged Youth

3a: Seventy percent of secondary-aged migrant students enrolled in summer migrant credit-bearing programs for at least three weeks will complete partial or full credit in one course required for high school graduation.

3b: Seventy-five percent of migrant high school students enrolled in schools with MEP projects for at least three months during the regular school year will work with migrant project staff to complete or update and sign their secondary graduation completion plan.

3c: Thirty percent of migrant-eligible out-of-school youth will participate in instructional services.

3d: Seventy percent of secondary-aged migrant students (both those attending a home-based program and those in a center-based program for at least three weeks during the

summer) will make progress toward the instructional/learning goals identified on their Secondary Student Services Plan.

- vii. Describe how the SEA will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the state and local level, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration, consistent with section 1304(c)(3) of the ESEA.

Illinois convenes a Migrant Parent Advisory Group at the state level and requires local projects that operate for one school year in duration to also convene a local parent advisory group. These groups provide advice and feedback about the MEP and how it could better serve their children's needs. All MEP projects conduct parent surveys during the summer to gather information about their satisfaction with the program and to ascertain ways to improve the academic quality of the programs. Survey responses are analyzed and the results are included in the annual program evaluation. Illinois has developed a series of parent workshops based on survey responses that focuses on topics of interest that are offered in different locations throughout the state.

- viii. Describe the SEA's priorities for use of Title I, Part C funds, specifically related to the needs of migratory children with "priority for services" under section 1304(d) of the ESEA, including:
 - i. The measures and sources of data the SEA, and if applicable, its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use to identify those migratory children who are a priority for services; and
 - ii. When and how the SEA will communicate those determinations to all local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, in the state.

The state establishes Title I, Part C funding parameters aligned with the results of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the Service Delivery Plan that specifically target the needs of migratory children with "priority for services" (PFS). The Title I, Part C grant application requires local funded entities to identify and give priority for service to PFS children and youth and to provide services that address the special needs of migratory children in accordance with the Illinois Service Delivery Plan.

Beginning July 1, 2017, PFS migratory children will be those who have made a qualifying move within the previous one-year period and who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet state academic standards or have dropped out of school. Currently, Illinois utilizes the following student characteristics to identify those who are most at risk of failing or have dropped out of school:

- Failed to meet state standards on state reading and/or math assessments (including students who were enrolled in the test window but were absent, exempt, not tested, or not scored);
- English Learner;
- Over-age for grade (e.g., student is older – two-plus years – than a typical student in that grade);
- Retained in grade; failed one or more core high school courses;
- Out-of-school youth or dropped out of school;
- Special education student

Data documenting previous moves and age is taken from the COE. Failure to meet state standards comes from assessment results on the state academic assessments. Standardized assessment results from another state reported on the NGS (e.g., Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills and STAAR scores) may be used as well. ELs are identified with state screening tools or annual English language proficiency assessment results. School records are used to document other criteria, including students being retained in a grade, students failing one or more high school courses, and students with IEPs or 504 Plans.

When a migrant child/youth is first identified, the recruiter collects information on the COE that relates to PFS. Local project staff compile relevant information from school records, migrant student data bases (including NGS and MSIX), and family interviews. PFS data for each migrant child and youth is entered in NGS by data entry specialists following timelines that conform to MSIX regulations. NGS uses current data to make PFS determinations for each migrant child/youth and produces a PFS report that includes the criteria used to make the determination for each child. Local projects generate the PFS report and use the detail provided to tailor services to the particular needs of each child/youth. Should the availability of migrant program services be limited, PFS children/youth receive priority for services.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

Describe the SEA's plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

ISBE provides technical assistance to Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice and the LEAs concerning transitional services that will enable neglected or delinquent youth to re-enter school successfully and/or to find employment after they leave the institution and return to the local

community. Transition coordinators for youth in the facility help youth and families as they enter and exit facilities. The goal of these coordinators is to reduce the time between the transition of records for some of the state's most vulnerable youth and to improve coordination across school districts for services and supports available for these youth. The services should include IDEA, workforce, and training services.

The state's plan is to assist the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs, including supporting comprehensive strategies to re-engage these youth, and offer community supports that improve the likelihood of success in communities with significant numbers of disconnected youth. ISBE will coordinate with IDJJ, neglected and delinquent institutions, and service agencies to coordinate services on behalf of youth served under this part.

Detailed transition plans will be included and required for LEAs and agencies to complete in their application for funding. ISBE continues to provide in-service training on programs and activities that IDJJ and the LEA may use to promote transitional services. These programs and activities can assist the LEA and the correctional facilities in developing a working relationship to accomplish a high-quality transitional program for the neglected or delinquent population.

IDJJ, in applying for these funds, completes an application that describes the type of transition services that will be used for students leaving the institutions for schools served by LEAs, postsecondary institutions, or vocational and technical training programs. These programs include, but are not limited to:

- Replacement programs that allow adjudicated or incarcerated youth to audit or attend courses on college, university, or community college campuses or through programs provided in institutional settings.
- Work-site schools in which institutions of higher education and private or public employers partner to create programs to help students make a successful transition to postsecondary education and employment.
- Essential support services to ensure the success of the youth such as:
 - Re-entry orientation programs, including transition centers in high schools;
 - Pupil services, including counseling, psychological, and social work services designed to meet the needs of neglected or delinquent children and youth;
 - Tutoring and mentoring programs;
 - Instruction and training at alternative schools and learning centers;
 - Services of in-school advocates on behalf of individual neglected or delinquent youth;

- Information concerning and assistance in obtaining available student financial aid; and
 - Job placement services.
- i. Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the state that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program, including the knowledge and skills needed to earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment.

The targets that ISBE has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of Title I, Part D in improving the academic, vocational, and technical skills of students being served by the program are:

1. To improve educational services for children and youth in local, tribal, and state institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state academic content standards and challenging state academic standards that all children in the state are expected to meet in order to obtain a high school diploma;
2. To provide such children and youth with the services needed to make a successful transition from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; and
3. To prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school and to provide dropouts and children and youth returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth with a support system to ensure their continued education and the involvement of their families and communities.

The performance indicators and the data sources are a combination of ISBE academic indicators and LEA information. Each individual institution/LEA collects achievement data based on the tests given at that institution and submits its assessment plan as part of its application. The LEA/institution is responsible for evaluating the results of the data and maintaining this information on file. The neglected or delinquent application process requires the applicant to describe its assessment plan, including the tests that will be administered to the youth and how the results of the tests will help to improve the neglected or delinquent program. Only those students attending a public school, although they live in the institution, will take the state tests. Agencies and LEAs will be required to submit a report biannually that reflects growth toward performance and assessment goals and targets. Additionally, ISBE collects demographic information and monitors the number of students participating in the neglected or delinquent services and the services provided. ISBE also collects information and data while providing technical assistance, such as on-site visits, to correctional institutions and local neglected or delinquent institutions.

D. Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students.

- i. Describe the SEA's standardized entrance and exit procedures for English Learners consistent with section 3113(b)(2) of the ESEA. These procedures must include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the state. At a minimum, the standardized exit criteria must:
 - i. Include a score of proficient on the state's annual English language proficiency assessment;
 - ii. Be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English Learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes; and
 - iii. Not include performance on an academic content assessment.

Each school administers the home language survey (HLS) to all students enrolling for the first time in preschool, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 through 12. Illinois plans to maintain the current practice of identifying ELs early and providing quality early childhood education that matches a child's cultural and linguistic needs. It is vital to consider native language screening and assessment in early childhood settings; teachers will not capture a full understanding of a student's knowledge and skills if they only assess children in the language in which they are least proficient. The HLS is administered in order to identify students who have a language background other than English, based on the language(s) used at home. A student is given a prescribed screening instrument to assess English language proficiency within 30 days of the student's enrollment or for preschool programs after first participating in the program. The child is tested in four domains of English; that is, speaking, listening, reading, and writing (pre-reading and pre-writing for students entering preschool-kindergarten). Each student whose score on the prescribed screening instrument is "not proficient" shall be considered an English Learner and thus eligible for, and placed in, an appropriate language assistance program.

All English Learners are assessed annually with the state's English language proficiency assessment. This assessment tool includes aural comprehension (listening), speaking, reading, and writing skills components. ISBE developed a definition in 2013 for English language proficiency to be applied to all English Learners. As a result, English Learners who obtained an overall composite score of 5.0 as well as a reading proficiency level of 4.2 and a writing proficiency level of 4.2 on the state's English language proficiency assessment were considered English language proficient. Students were then exited from the program of bilingual services and no longer identified as English Learners.

ISBE is currently reviewing and revising the definition of English language proficiency applied to all English Learners. A group of stakeholders that includes researchers, administrators at the local and school level, teachers, and parents are currently meeting to

revise the state's definition of English language proficiency. This new criteria will be used for ELs in the EL subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes.

English Learners will be assessed annually for English proficiency and for English language arts and mathematics. Illinois will assess newly arrived ELs, enrolled in their first year in US schools, in grades 3-12 in academic content areas: English language arts, mathematics and science. Data from the first year assessments will not be included in accountability determination but serve solely for baseline purposes.

E. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

- i. Describe how the SEA will use its Title IV, Part B, and other federal funds to support state-level strategies that are consistent with the strategies identified in 6.1.A starting on page 60.

Title IV(b) funding will be leveraged with other federal funds to increase the state's ability to address performance gaps in learning and healthy development for the most vulnerable children; meaningfully engage families as critical partners; connect community systems with schools and districts in sustainable ways; and, in partnership with the afterschool statewide network, ensure implementation of high quality out of school time programming throughout the state that leads to increased student achievement.

Two percent of the funds will be used for state administration. This includes using funds to pay for administration and peer reviewers of the subgrant applications. These activities will be done in consultation with the Governor's Office and other state agencies responsible for administering youth development programs and adult learning activities.¹⁶¹

Five percent of the funds will be used for state activities. The funds will be used to pay for the following as outlined in ESSA, Title IV, Part B, Section 4202 (c)(3):

- Monitoring and evaluating programs and activities.
- Providing capacity building, training, and technical assistance.
- Conducting a comprehensive evaluation (directly or through a grant or contract) of the effectiveness of programs and activities assisted.
- Providing training and technical assistance to eligible entities that are applicants for or recipients of awards.

¹⁶¹ These agencies include, but are not limited to, the Illinois Department of Human Services, the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Illinois Community College Board.

- Ensuring that any eligible entity that receives an award under this part from the state aligns the activities provided by the program with the challenging state academic standards.
- Ensuring that any such eligible entity identifies and partners with external organizations, if available, in the community.
- Working with teachers, principals, parents, the local workforce, the local community, and other stakeholders to review and improve state policies and practices to support the implementation of effective programs.
- Coordinating funds received with other federal and state funds to implement high-quality programs.
- Providing a list of prescreened external organizations, as described under section 4203(a)(11).

The remaining 93 percent of funds will be awarded to eligible applicants through competitive subgrants using a peer review process. A financial and programmatic risk assessment will need to be completed in order to receive the funds.

- ii. Describe the SEA's processes, procedures, and priorities used to award subgrants consistent with the strategies identified in 6.1.A. starting on page 60 and to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations.

Illinois awards subgrants on a competitive process to school districts, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, Regional Offices of Education and Intermediate Service Centers, state-authorized charter schools, and other public and private entities. An eligible entity must serve schools with 40 percent or higher low-income student population. A Notice of Funding Opportunity is released on the ISBE website and through the GATA website. The applicants have 45 days to submit their proposal. The applications are scored by a minimum of three peer reviewers using a merit-based review. Applications are also reviewed by ISBE staff to ensure eligibility and meeting past performance criteria.¹⁶² Applicants are required to describe in the narrative how they will meet the needs of these subgroups, including how activities are expected to improve student academic achievement as well as overall student success, integrate quality programming standards, and engage stakeholders on an ongoing basis. Following the initial award of a subgrant, continuation beyond the initial funding period is based on whether a subgrantee

¹⁶² The Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) has a provision that includes priority points for serving lowest-performing eligible schools. Information is included in the NOFO to coordinate with other programs that work with the subgroups.

has made substantial progress toward meeting the objectives stated in its approved proposal. The 21st CCLC grantees will be monitored on what they proposed in their grant to ensure the fidelity of the program. Grantees will also do a fiscal and programmatic risk assessment each year when they apply. Monitoring of 21st CCLC grantees will be connected to the required risk assessments completed as part of the awarding of the grant process.

F. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program.

- i. i. Provide the SEA's specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program, if applicable.

Districts primarily use Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program funds for activities to increase the academic achievement of students. Thus, the program objective will be to measure the academic achievement of students as described in Accountability System. (See 4.1 starting on page 30.) Specifically, the Academic Achievement indicators PARCC (3-8) and SAT (high school),(4.1, A.,i.) will be used to drive the RLIS program.

G. McKinney-Vento Act.

- i. Consistent with section 722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act, describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the state and assess their needs.

The Illinois State Board of Education has established procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths are afforded the same educational opportunities to be successful learners as all other children and youths. Ensuring that all Illinois students develop the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the 21st century is a challenge that public schools face because of the large increase in homelessness over the past five years. Cross-coordination of programs is essential to the goal in ESSA that all students, including homeless children and youth, will meet state academic standards.

ISBE will prepare and disseminate to LEAs guidance documents, notices, or letters summarizing the new and existing Education for Homeless Children and Youth program requirements and share McKinney-Vento guidance provided by ED. Notices will be provided on the ISBE website,¹⁶³ by teleconferencing, and through trainings and workshops.

¹⁶³ For additional information, please access <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Homeless.aspx>.

Illinois is a regionally designed state that has established procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths are afforded the same opportunities to be successful learners as all children and youths. The landscape for providing those opportunities is coordinated by Illinois' state coordinator for the education of homeless children and youth. The state coordinator oversees an Office of the Coordinator and lead area liaisons (LALs).

Homeless children and youths in Illinois will be identified by school personnel and through coordination of activities with other entities, such as homeless shelters and community service agencies. The Common Form¹⁶⁴ was created for LEAs to use when enrolling homeless children and youths. In addition to information on enrolling children and youths into school, it also asks for other children and youths residing in the home to be listed. That allows LEA homeless liaisons to reach out to families with preschool-aged children to assist with finding preschool placement for that child. It also allows LEAs to work with families who may need early intervention services for children ages birth to 3 years of age.

The homeless education liaisons are trained to educate and work closely with all personnel in the school district as well as with community social service agencies and Continuum of Care programs to ensure that homeless children and youths are identified. (See (<http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/states/illinois/homeless/cocontacts>.) Continuum of Care programs funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development are represented in every Illinois community and are responsible for locally coordinating services to homeless families.

A close working relationship between homeless education liaisons and staff of the Continuum of Care programs is critical to meeting the educational and support services needed by homeless families. A key part of training for school personnel and social service agencies will be to emphasize the need to sensitively identify families in homeless situations and the need to be respectful of the families' privacy. Sensitive questions to ask when dealing with homeless families can be found on the National Center for Homeless Education website at http://center.serve.org/nche/downloads/briefs/det_elig.pdf.

- ii. Describe the SEA's programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Act, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and

¹⁶⁴ To access the Common Form, go to <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/83-01-common-form.pdf>.

homeless youths.

All school personnel continue to gain in understanding of the specific needs of homeless children and youths by participating in ongoing trainings on the McKinney-Vento Homeless Program conducted by LALs and LEA homeless education liaisons.

LALs and LEA homeless education liaisons will work collaboratively to identify homeless youths not currently attending school. The liaisons will work to ensure that these youths are connected to available services in the community and will help them to enroll in available before- and after-school programs, as appropriate.

Unaccompanied youths include young people who have run away from home, been thrown out of their homes, and/or have been abandoned by parents/guardians/caregivers. Unaccompanied youths have the same rights as other students experiencing homelessness. These young people are separated from their parents for a variety of reasons. They face unique barriers to enrolling and succeeding in school. Without a parent or guardian to advocate for them and exercise parental rights, they are sometimes denied enrollment and remain out of school for extended periods of time. They may not understand their educational rights or know how to acquire this information. Removal of barriers to transportation, immediate enrollment, and the right to return to the school of origin must be addressed.¹⁶⁵ ISBE ensures that schools are doing this through monitoring and through continuous trainings and contact with LEA homeless liaisons.

Unaccompanied youths with special needs: The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 offers guidelines pertaining to unaccompanied youths with disabilities as defined by IDEA.¹⁶⁶

- iii. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved.

Ensuring that families have equal access to educational opportunities is of critical importance to Illinois' McKinney-Vento program. Equally as important is the ability of students and families to be afforded procedural due process rights in cases where a district

¹⁶⁵ For additional information on the rights of unaccompanied youths, please access <http://center.serve.org/nche/downloads/briefs/youth.pdf>.

¹⁶⁶ For additional information on unaccompanied youths with special needs, please see <http://center.serve.org/nche/downloads/briefs/idea.pdf>.

disagrees with an assertion of homelessness or issues related to homelessness. The Illinois Education for Homeless Children Act [105 ILCS 45] provides the basis for dispute resolution procedures by requiring that the applicable regional superintendent of schools “appoint ombudsperson who is fair and impartial and familiar with the educational rights and needs of homeless children to provide resource information and resolve disputes at schools within his or her jurisdiction relating to the rights of homeless children under this Act.”¹⁶⁷ In furtherance of the Illinois Education for Homeless Children Act and in accordance with the McKinney-Vento Act, the following procedures constitute Illinois’s dispute resolution process for homeless students.

If the State Superintendent of Education or designee determines that the district’s action giving rise to the dispute is inconsistent with applicable law, he/she may order the district to take any action necessary for such district to be in compliance with applicable law. Should the district not comply with such order, the State Superintendent shall place the district’s recognition status on probation in accordance with 23 Ill. Admin. Code 1.20(b).

The LEA homeless education liaisons will receive training on the dispute resolution processes by the LALs. Their duty as homeless education liaison is to represent homeless youths who may be involved in a disagreement related to their homeless status and education. The regional superintendents of education will appoint an ombudsperson at the beginning of the school year and the ombudsperson will complete an annual training relative to their position.

- iv. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that that youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies.

Information about a McKinney-Vento student’s living situation is a student education record subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (11432(g)(3)(G). LEA homeless liaisons are required to ensure that unaccompanied homeless youths are enrolled in school, have opportunities to meet the same challenging state academic standards as other children and youths, and are informed of their status as independent students under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Youths must be assured that they may

¹⁶⁷ Illinois School Code 105 ILCS 45/1-15 (a).

obtain assistance from the LEA liaison to receive verification of such status for purposes of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (Section 722(g)(6))A)(x)). Liaisons must assist unaccompanied youths in receiving the help they need from counselors to advise and prepare them for college and ensure that procedures are implemented to identify and remove barriers that prevent students from receiving credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed at a prior school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies.

The goal for unaccompanied homeless youths is to improve high school graduation and college readiness by maximizing credit accrual, ensuring college counseling and access to financial aid, providing school stability during the vulnerable transition from middle school to high school, and requiring states to report disaggregated achievement and graduation data for homeless youths. Procedures in Illinois law eliminate barriers to academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs (11432(g)(1)(F)(iii)).

The LALs and the LEA homeless education liaison will be responsible for annual trainings for district and program staff on the needs of runaway and homeless youths. It is their responsibility to disseminate information about homeless youths and to update information on unaccompanied youths to all sites where youths may gather to educate and inform them of their rights. The LAL and LEA liaisons will develop collaborative relationships with shelters and service providers focusing on unaccompanied youth. School district personnel will receive training on the education right of unaccompanied youth, including guardianship issues that cannot exclude enrollment. Abiding by the guidelines defined in the IDEA 2004 relative to homeless unaccompanied youth with a disability of special educational needs will be addressed as well as the need for referral to social service agencies for needed services.

- i. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths:
 - i. Have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the state;
 - ii. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities; and
 - iii. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, are able to participate in federal, state, and local nutrition programs.

The LAL for each of the seven regions must ensure that homeless children receive the services that they need to become successful, lifelong learners. The LAL should

work with other service providers in their region, such as Continuum of Care, shelters, food banks, and health and housing providers to assist families in homeless situations. Active working partnerships will allow all entities to be able to provide services that address the needs of homeless families and to identify children age birth to 5 who are in need of early childhood education services.

- a. LEA homeless education liaisons will identify homeless families with preschool-age children during initial school enrollment or as part of the identification of a family's transitional status during the academic year and will collect data on all children in the family. It is the responsibility of the homeless liaison to ensure that the homeless children and their families have equal access to ISBE-funded preschools available in their community and to make referrals to all early childhood programs of any kind that homeless children age birth to 5 may be eligible for within their community service area.

ISBE early childhood programs are those included in the Early Childhood Block Grant, Prevention Initiative for Programs Offering Coordinated Services to At-Risk Children and Their Families from Birth to Age 3 Years, and Preschool for All Children Ages 3 to 5 Years. The Prevention Initiative Program provides early, continuous, intensive, and comprehensive child development and family support services to help families build a strong foundation for learning to prepare children for later school success.

The Preschool for All initiative focuses on providing high-quality educational programs for children who are determined to be at risk of academic failures. First priority is given to children at preschool screenings who are determined to be at risk of academic failures due to environmental and developmental delays. A disproportionate share of children come from low-income working families, homeless families, teen parent families, or families where English is not the primary language spoken in the home. Homeless children and youths are a priority in this high-risk category and if slots are available at the time of enrollment, homeless children must be enrolled immediately. If no slots are available, the child must be placed at the top of the program's waiting list. Children who are at a greater risk of academic failure may be rescreened within the first 30 days of school attendance.

ISBE believes that the educational development and success of all Illinois children can be significantly enhanced when children participate in early childhood programs. Community services coupled with a commitment to supporting early childhood education will give additional support to ensuring that all Illinois children have the opportunity to develop a strong foundation for learning. These two factors help make the ultimate goal of having students be college and career ready more attainable.

District homeless liaisons will also assist families to access federally funded Head Start programs, when appropriate. Head Start has specific local criteria for meeting the needs of homeless children in the community. Head Start provides information about families their staff identifies as in need of homeless education services. Head Start programs identify a need that closely aligns their family service provisions for early childhood students with local homeless education liaisons to coordinate services. Head Start staff members often have collaborative relationships with local public health clinics and may be able to obtain immunization records to ensure that homeless children do not receive excessive immunizations due to their living situation.

ISBE collects data for LEAs- and ISBE-funded birth to 3 and preschool programs (e.g., Prevention Initiative, Preschool for All, Preschool Expansion Grant, and other district-funded programs) through the Student Information System (SIS). Data collected through SIS for kindergarten through grade 12 is significantly higher than birth to age 5 data. Based on research, there are more children between birth and age 5 that are in a homeless situation than any other age group. A focus will be placed on training all LEA- and ISBE-funded Early Childhood programs personnel to collect and enter data on homeless children that they serve as they identify, enroll, and provide services for the children.

- b. Extracurricular school activities, such as sports, music, theater, debate, and clubs, are often a key to engaging children and youths in school. They can provide students with a sense of belonging, stability, pride, and responsibility and strengthen a student's application for higher education admission and scholarships.

Homelessness can create barriers to participation in extracurricular activities. Homeless students who change schools during the school year may not meet residency requirements related to sports or may enter school in the middle of the season. They may lack birth certificates, physical examinations, and other documents normally required prior to participation and may not be able to pay for equipment or fees. The McKinney-Vento Act provides legal rights and support to help ensure that students experiencing homelessness can participate fully in extracurricular school activities.

LEAs are required to enroll children and youths experiencing homelessness immediately. “Enroll” is defined in the McKinney-Vento Act as specifically “attending classes and participating fully in school activities.” Therefore, homeless students must be allowed to enroll and participate immediately in class and other academic activities and extracurricular school activities, such as sports, music, and clubs.

- c. Materials developed and disseminated online include information regarding the right of homeless children and youths to receive services under the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program. These materials are reviewed and revised on a continuous basis to ensure that information is current and effectual and meets the needs of students experiencing homelessness and their families. School officials may accept documentation that the children are homeless from the local education liaisons or directors of homeless shelters where the children reside to expedite the delivery of nutritional programs. Documentation to substantiate free meal eligibility must consist of the child’s name or a list of names, effective date(s), and the signature of the local education liaison or the director of the homeless shelter. This documentation is acceptable in lieu of a free and reduced-price meal application.

Additionally, implementation of these expedited procedures encourages public school determination officials to work closely with the homeless education liaison to ensure that homeless children and youths are provided free meal benefits as promptly as possible. School food service personnel must be promptly advised when homeless children and youths leave school or are no longer considered homeless. Households or unaccompanied youths must be provided with an application for free and reduced-price

meals when the family or youths are no longer considered homeless. The homeless education liaison must carefully evaluate each child's situation. Homeless children and youths residing with another household application process will not include the size and household income of the "host family" to determine eligibility for free or reduced-price meal eligibility. The "host family" may now also be eligible for free or reduced-price meals based on the total number in the household and can be provided temporary approval for this eligibility until the homeless family leaves the "host family" residence.

Unaccompanied youths who live alone are to be considered a household of one based on the definition of "emancipated child" in the Eligibility Guidance for School Meals Manual. Section 107 (Runaway, Homeless, and Migrant Youth Directive USDA update from the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, Public Law 108-265, which amended the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act). It states that effective July 1, 2004, homeless, runaway, and migrant children are categorically eligible for free school meals. No application is required for these children, as they may be directly certified based on lists provided by the local shelter director, a school district homeless education liaison, a migrant education coordinator, or similar officials. The lists must contain the child's name and a signature and date of the official making the determination. The eligibility lasts for the full school year regardless of changes in status as runaway, homeless, or migrant.

All homeless education liaisons are trained in using ISBE, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and McKinney-Vento guidance and materials. The USDA guidance also is used as a guide to state and local food programs. ISBE staff members who work with school nutrition programs are trained on an ongoing basis to maintain the most current information related to the USDA regulations pertaining to families with children or youths who are experiencing homelessness, on the McKinney-Vento Act, and on the role of the homeless education liaisons. They work with their contacts at local schools to make sure that local nutrition staff members are familiar with the local homeless education liaison.

- ii. Describe the SEA's strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.

ISBE adopted a policy on the education of homeless children and youths in December 1995 to ensure that the Illinois Education of Homeless Children and Youth Act is fully implemented. It requires all Illinois school districts to comply fully with the policy and with federal and state laws affecting the rights of homeless children and youths. The ISBE policy requires that all LEAs review any rules or regulations, practices, or policies that may act as barriers to the enrollment of homeless children and youths and take steps to revise them so that homeless children and youths are afforded the same opportunities as the non-homeless. The policy also emphasizes the importance of homeless students attending their school or origin without interruption, whenever possible. The policy, along with the strong state law on the education of homeless Illinois children, means Illinois has taken every possible step to ensure that homeless children have the opportunity to meet state academic standards. A federal law modeled after the Illinois law has some additional requirements beyond those included in the Illinois law. ISBE will review the federal law and adopt an updated policy that directly supports it.

Consolidated State Plan Assurances

Instructions: Each SEA submitting a consolidated state plan must review the assurances below and demonstrate agreement by selecting the boxes provided.

- ☐ **Coordination.** The SEA must assure that it coordinated its plans for administering the included programs, other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
- ☐ **Challenging academic standards and academic assessments.** The SEA must assure that the state will meet the standards and assessments requirements of sections 1111(b)(1)(A)-(F) and 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA and applicable regulations.
- ☐ **State support and improvement for low performing schools.** The SEA must assure that it will approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans consistent with requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v) and (vi) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(e).
- ☐ **Participation by private school children and teachers.** The SEA must assure that it will meet the requirements of sections 1117 and 8501 of the ESEA regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.
- ☐ **Appropriate identification of children with disabilities.** The SEA must assure that it has policies and procedures in effect regarding the appropriate identification of children with disabilities consistent with the child find and evaluation requirements in section 612(a)(3) and (a)(7) of the IDEA, respectively.
- ☐ **Ensuring equitable access to Federal programs.** The SEA must assure that, consistent with section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), it described the steps the SEA will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs as addressed in sections described below (e.g., 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools, 5.3 Educator Equity).

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX LETTER	PAGE NUMBER	DOCUMENT TITLE
A		Measurements of Interim Progress
B		Educator Equity Differences in Rates Tables
C		Educator Equity Extension Plan and Differences in Rates Tables
D		List of Stakeholder Meetings And Maps of Listening Tour Locations
E		The PARCC Table Showing the 10 Languages In Illinois During the Last Three School Years
F		2015 Illinois Equity Plan
G		Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual

APPENDIX A: MEASUREMENTS OF INTERIM PROGRESS

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (except that measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency must only be described for English Learners), consistent with the state's minimum number of students. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the state's measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower-achieving or graduating at lower rates, respectively.

A. Academic Achievement

ISBE created a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals, that emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The state-level long-term goals and measurements of interim progress are based on progressive increases in the percentage of all learners in Illinois who make annual progress toward the long-term goals. The target of 90 percent readiness is based on the vision adopted by the Board in September of 2015. A baseline will be established from the most recent three years of academic achievement assessment data. Once the baseline for academic achievement within each school has been established, the 90 percent target to 2032 will be back mapped with three-year interim goals.¹⁶⁸

ISBE will be using a three-year composite average to establish its baseline performance levels and measures of interim progress. Baseline data will not be available until an assessment has been administered and recorded for all student demographic groups for three consecutive years

B. Graduation Rates

ISBE created a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals, that emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The state-level long-term goals and measurements of interim progress are based on

¹⁶⁸ In 2014-15, ISBE began requiring that students in Illinois complete PARCC in third through 12th grades. Prior to the beginning of the 2016-17 school year, ISBE required that all students in grade 11 would complete the SAT during the school day. As a result, ISBE will not have stable data on academic achievement in third through eighth grades until the 2017-18 school year and the 2018-19 academic year for students in high school.

progressive increases in the graduation rate. The target of 90 percent readiness is based on the vision adopted by the Board in September of 2015. A baseline will be established from the most recent three years of graduation data. Once the baseline for graduation rate within each school has been established, the 90 percent target to 2032 will be back mapped with three-year interim goals.

C. English Language Proficiency

ISBE created a 15-year timeline, with three-year interim goals, that emerged from the accountability stakeholder work groups and is consistent with the timeline for improvement for schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports and services. The target of 90 percent readiness is based on the vision adopted by the Board in September of 2015. The state-level long-term goals and measurements of interim progress are based on increases in the percentage of all English Learners in Illinois who make annual progress toward English language proficiency. A baseline will be established over the most recent three years of ELP assessment data in consideration of WIDA's standard-setting. Once the baseline for ACCESS for ELLs within each school has been established, the 90 percent target to 2032 will be back mapped with three-year interim goals.

APPENDIX B: EDUCATOR EQUITY DIFFERENCES IN RATES

Instructions: Each SEA must complete the appropriate table(s) below. Each SEA calculating and reporting student-level data must complete, at a minimum, the table under the header “Differences in Rates Calculated Using Student-Level Data”.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Differences between rates
Low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	Box E: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box E) – (Box F)	Box I: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box I) – (Box J)
Non-low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		Box F: enter rate as a percentage		Box J: enter rate as a percentage	
Minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	Box G: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box G) – (Box H)	Box K: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box K) – (Box L)
Non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		Box H: enter rate as a percentage		Box L: enter rate as a percentage	

If the SEA has defined other optional key terms, it must complete the table below.

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 1	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 2	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 3	Differences between rates
Low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	Box E: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box E) – (Box F)	Box I: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box I) – (Box J)
Non-low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		Box F: enter rate as a percentage		Box J: enter rate as a percentage	
Minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	Box G: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box G) – (Box H)	Box K: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box K) – (Box L)
Non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		Box H: enter rate as a percentage		Box L: enter rate as a percentage	

APPENDIX C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION

Instructions: If an SEA requests an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3), it must: (1) provide a detailed plan and timeline addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level and (2) complete the tables below.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING DATA OTHER THAN STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher ¹⁶⁹	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher ¹⁷⁰	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher ¹⁷¹	Differences between rates
Low-income students	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	1.8	.1.8	8.5	4.1
Non-low-income students	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		0		4.4	
Minority students	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	1.7	1.6	8.6	3.2
Non-minority students	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		.1		5.4	

Student level data will be available at the end of October 2017.

¹⁶⁹ The 2016-17 school year was the first year in which all schools must collect data on teacher effectiveness that includes both teacher practice and student growth. Thus, data for the differences between differences the rates in which low-income and non-low income students and minority and non-minority students are taught by ineffective teachers will be available in October 2017.

¹⁷⁰ 2014 school level data was used for these calculations.

¹⁷¹ 2014 district level data was used for these calculations.

DRAFT

APPENDIX D: LIST OF STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND MAPS OF LISTENING TOUR LOCATIONS

APPENDIX E: THE PARCC TABLE SHOWING THE 10 LANGUAGES IN ILLINOIS DURING THE LAST THREE SCHOOL YEARS

APPENDIX F: EQUITY PLAN

APPENDIX G: ILLINOIS MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION AND RECRUITMENT MANUAL

DRAFT